

CASE INVESTIGATIONS: 226

Assistance Provided - 37
Information Provided - 85
DOC Resolved – 17
Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate - 26
No Violation of Policy - 51
Substantiated - 10

INTAKE INVESTIGATIONS: 61

Administrative Remedies Not Pursued - 35
Declined - 22
Lacked Jurisdiction - 2
Person Declined OCO Involvement - 2
Person Left DOC Custody Prior to OCO Action - 0

Resolved Investigations: **287**

Assistance or Information Provided in
OVER 54%
of Case Investigations

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

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

Assistance Provided	The OCO achieved full or partial resolution of the person's complaint.	37
Information Provided	The OCO provided self-advocacy information.	85
DOC Resolved	DOC staff resolved the concern prior to OCO action.	17
Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate	Insufficient evidence existed to substantiate the concern.	26
No Violation of Policy	The OCO determined that DOC policy was not violated.	51
Substantiated	The OCO verified the concern but was unable to achieve a resolution to the concern.	10

Administrative Remedies Not Pursued	The incarcerated person did not yet pursue internal resolution per RCW 43.06C.040(2)(b).	35
Declined	The OCO declined to investigate the complaint per WAC 138-10-040(3).	22
Lacked Jurisdiction	The complaint did not meet OCO's jurisdictional requirements (typically when complaint is not about an incarcerated person or not about a DOC action).	2
Person Declined OCO Involvement	The person did not want the OCO to pursue the concern or the OCO received no response to requests for more information.	2
Person Left DOC Custody	The incarcerated person left DOC custody prior to OCO action.	0

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

MONTHLY OUTCOME REPORT

February 2023

COMPLAINT SUMMARY	OUTCOME SUMMARY	CASE CLOSURE REASON
CASE INVESTIGATIONS		
Airway Heights Corrections Center		
<p>1. Incarcerated individual reports DOC is prohibiting the playing of any tabletop role-playing games such as Dungeons and Dragons. The individual reports these types of games do not violate any DOC policy and can be pro-social, therapeutic, and offer a creative outlet for incarcerated individuals.</p>	<p>The OCO provided assistance. The OCO reviewed relevant Operational Memorandums and reviewed relevant research regarding the positive influence tabletop role-playing games can provide to incarcerated individuals. After the OCO made inquiries about DOC prohibiting these games, the DOC shared that they would allow individuals to play tabletop role-playing games.</p>	<p>Assistance Provided</p>
<p>2. Incarcerated individual reports he was threatened by DOC staff to transfer to a different facility. The individual reports they want to stay at Airway Heights Corrections Center (AHCC) and DOC staff are telling him they want him out of AHCC and sent to another facility. The individual has refused housing at the other facility due to Security Threat Group (STG) concerns. The individual reports he told staff about the safety concerns he would experience, but staff did not record the concerns.</p>	<p>The OCO provided assistance. The OCO verified that the individual was refusing transfer because of STG concerns and followed up with DOC staff multiple times requesting action be taken to find safe placement for this person. After an extended period of placement in AHCC's Special Management Unit (SMU), DOC determined placement for the individual, initially recommending medium custody. DOC's final determination was to transfer the individual to a maximum custody program, due to a serious infraction received while in the SMU. The OCO aided in recommending DOC find meaningful placement for this individual, although the OCO does substantiate that this individual was held in SMU for an extended period while DOC was working on a plan for his placement.</p>	<p>Assistance Provided</p>
<p>3. The incarcerated individual reports that he did not receive a reply to a resolution request he appealed.</p>	<p>The OCO provided assistance. This office contacted the DOC HQ Resolution Program who confirmed that they sent the response to the appeal of the resolution request the individual mentioned in the concern. The individual had moved facilities around the time the response was initially sent and may not have received the information due to the move.</p>	<p>Assistance Provided</p>
<p>4. Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about an infraction the OCO helped them have overturned previously as DOC has recently recalculated their time and added back in the time that</p>	<p>The OCO reached out to DOC regarding the previous negotiated outcome for this infraction. Due to a facility level confusion about the individual's time, DOC had put the infraction back on the individual's record. As a result, the OCO requested this be removed and the</p>	<p>Assistance Provided</p>

	corresponded to the infraction the OCO had overturned.	individual's time be properly calculated which the DOC agreed to.	
5.	Incarcerated individual reports DOC has not followed-up on a Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) violation he reported. The individual reports DOC has not provided the findings of the investigation and it has been over ten months. The individual requests the OCO review the status of the PREA investigation and help move the DOC investigation forward.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO verified that the PREA investigation has been severely delayed. The OCO spoke with DOC staff and followed up multiple times with no updates on the PREA investigation. DOC staff explained they would not investigate until law enforcement completed their investigation. The OCO reviewed DOC 490.100 Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) Investigation and found documentation is required to be sent to law enforcement explaining the actions of DOC and when they will be performed. After some time, the OCO identified DOC staff had not filed proper documentation related to the investigation. Once filed, the document shows DOC should have completed the investigation before law enforcement begins their own. The OCO shared this with DOC administration who worked to begin the investigation after it was severely delayed.	Assistance Provided
6.	Person reports that his custody facility plan (CFP) was done, requesting transfer to Monroe Corrections Center (MCC), and that he just needs DOC approval. Person reports struggling with PTSD and depression and that he felt dismissed and not taken seriously by the therapist and mental health staff at his current facility. Person wants to be transferred to Monroe to be closer to family and support system.	The OCO reached out to DOC and verified that this person will be transferred to MCC. The OCO also requested a wellness check and ensured that he has access to talk to a primary therapist at his current facility.	Assistance Provided
7.	Patient reports delay in receiving a medical appointment. He says this is an ongoing issue he experienced several times this year.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO reviewed the patient's appointments and found they were scheduled and seen this month and scheduled for additional follow ups next month.	DOC Resolved
8.	An external person reports that an incarcerated individual's cell was searched but a search report was not left for the individual or his cellmate. The external person also reports DOC staff created a mess in the cell after the search. The external person believes this was retaliation because of another incident that occurred in their cell in previous days.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO verified DOC substantiated the concern about DOC staff failing to provide a search report. The OCO verified there is a lack of evidence to substantiate if the cell was searched and left in disarray as an act of retaliation. The OCO verified that the external person received a detailed response from DOC about the investigation completed.	DOC Resolved
9.	The incarcerated individual reports that he was working a gratuity wage job and	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO spoke	DOC Resolved

never got paid for some of the time he worked. The individual reports he spoke with DOC staff, and they confirmed that he was not paid, but nothing has been done to remedy the issue. The individual reports he made contact with DOC staff, and they said they would look into the issue but nothing has been resolved. The individual also filed a resolution request, but it was not accepted per the resolution program manual (RPM) because the incident occurred in July and the individual did not address the concern until months later.

to DOC staff and verified the individual was paid the gratuity owed before any OCO contact.

10. Person reports he has been waiting several months to get fillings completed by dental. He has attempted to resolve through DOC but was told it would be several more months before he would be seen.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO verified the dental appointment was scheduled by DOC and tracked this appointment on the appointment tracker to monitor for completion. The OCO verified that the patient has received treatment per his dental treatment plan. The OCO substantiated that there are many cases of dental care that have been delayed by facility outbreaks. DOC dental is working to get care to patients, prioritizing urgent and emergency care.	DOC Resolved
11. The incarcerated individual reports that visiting starts late at his facility because of COVID testing prior to visitors being allowed into the facility. This is cutting into the time individuals get to spend with their family, and they are wondering why staff cannot test the visitors earlier so that it does not impact their visit. This individual also reports that, if count happens during their visit, they are required to go back to their cell for count. This is also a problem because they are gone for an hour or more while their visitor is left waiting for count to clear. This person has been at other facilities that they do count in the visiting room while visits are happening.	The OCO provided the individual information regarding visiting protocols at AHCC. The OCO spoke with DOC staff who explained that visitors can come as early as 11:30 AM to be COVID-19 tested prior to entering the visiting room. Visitors are encouraged to come early so they can be cleared and enter the building on time. The OCO also verified that AHCC does not have count during visiting hours and have planned their visiting schedule to not interfere with count.	Information Provided
12. Person reports that the Asian Pacific Islander Group is trying to contact the Associate Superintendent. Person reports the group has had meetings with the cultural group coordinator, who initially agreed to support group events, and then later told them the group could not do	The OCO informed the individual that this office will be at Airway Heights Corrections Center on February 16 and will talk about this issue with facility leadership.	Information Provided

their events. The group president usually assigns roles to individuals for events, but then the cultural coordinator sent out a message saying that any individual could sign up and that DOC would choose the members. The person feels that DOC has dismantled the Asian Pacific Islander Group at Airway Heights Corrections Center.

<p>13. The incarcerated individual reports that they submitted a resolution request and did not receive a response. The individual reports that they tried to resolve an infraction by filing a resolution request and sending a kite but has not received a response.</p>	<p>The OCO provided information regarding the process of appealing an infraction. Per DOC 460.000 Disciplinary Process for Prisons, incarcerated individuals may appeal the decision and/or sanctions for a guilty finding within two business days of receiving the decision by submitting form DOC 17-074, Disciplinary Hearing Appeal, including the reason the individual believes the action taken was incorrect and the desired relief.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>14. Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about money being deducted from a tribal check that should have been exempt.</p>	<p>The OCO contacted DOC to see if this concern had been resolved. The check that was sent to DOC Headquarters was non-exempt tribal funds. This meant that the form the tribes are required to send with each deposit indicating the source of the funds to be deposited showed that the funds were not exempt from deduction. DOC responded to the individual's kiosk messages by sharing this information and explaining that not all tribal checks are exempt from deductions.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>15. Incarcerated individual reports DOC inmate banking is taking out deductions that is putting his account below the \$25.00 indigent amount. The individual reports this is not allowed per his judgment and sentence (J&S) and per recent legislation passed.</p>	<p>The OCO provided information regarding court ordered deductions and how to obtain information about the deductions taken. The OCO reviewed the individual's deductions during the time of the reported concern and found deductions were taken in compliance with DOC 200.000 Trust Accounts for Incarcerated Individuals. The OCO shared with the individual how to get in contact with the facility banking staff and how to request his banking statements to review them.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>16. Incarcerated individual reports the DOC staff member they filed a Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) violation report about is still working on the unit. The individual reported this to PREA and requests that the OCO ensure that the PREA violation reports are being handled. The individual reports that PREA violations he filed in the past also were</p>	<p>The OCO provided the individual with information about DOC PREA investigation process. The OCO verified the PREA reports are still under investigation by the DOC. The DOC does not have a documented timeframe of when PREA investigations are to be completed. The OCO shared with the individual how to request information about the investigation and shared that if they would like OCO to review the</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>

not handled properly and requests OCO review. The individual reports harassment from staff because of the PREA violation report.

PREA investigation, to contact OCO once DOC completes it.

17.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about mail being copied incompletely and not in color.	The OCO contacted DOC regarding this issue. For the colored copy concern, DOC HQ has issued the directive for facilities to not print in color as not all mailrooms have color printers and to not copy photos. If a copy is incomplete, the individual can contact the mailroom and they will make another copy as the originals are retained.	Information Provided
18.	The incarcerated individual has a concern with his time calculation. He reports that records staff lack legal training and keep misinterpreting his judgment and sentence (J&S), statutes, and case law.	The OCO provided information about this person's next steps to file a personal restraint petition. Decisions can be appealed by filing a Personal Restraint Petition (PRP) to the Court of Appeals. The OCO mailed a PRP form to this individual.	Information Provided
19.	Person's attorney asked him to obtain a time calculation so that he can get a warrant removed. The CUS at the facility told him that he cannot give him his time calculation. Person states that he is on a legal deadline, and it is time sensitive that he gets this information to his attorney.	The OCO provided information regarding how to obtain a copy of a time calculation to the incarcerated. They can send a kite or kiosk message to the records department at the facility.	Information Provided
20.	Person reports that he slipped and fell on the ice and snow, injuring himself, as did another incarcerated person. Person reported the fall to a DOC staff person and did not provide assistance for medical attention. He later declared a medical emergency. Medical staff dismissed his injuries, and he no longer feels he can rely on DOC for medical care or trust his wellbeing and safety are taken seriously.	The OCO reviewed the individual's grievances related to this concern and see they were closed at level 0 with an informal resolution including that the facility was check out the area of the ice and the individual was seen by medical. The individual was informed that if they disagree with these outcomes, they will need to take the grievance to the next level, as the OCO requires a level 2 response for all non-medical concerns and level 1 response for medical concerns. The OCO informed the individual if they are having ongoing medical concerns they can kite medical. The individual's resolution was to be paid for pain and suffering; the OCO provided information to the individual about how they can submit a tort claim with the Office of Risk Management. The OCO did not review the specific staff conduct concerns as the individual did not grieve staff misconduct and did not provide the name of the staff member about whom they were concerned.	Information Provided
21.	The incarcerated individual reports that the kiosk machine in their unit is not	The OCO provided information regarding the kiosk machine sometimes timing out. This office spoke with DOC staff in the individual's unit who	Information Provided

working properly.

report that the machine does sometimes time out, but if an individual touches the screen it will come on again after a few seconds. DOC staff is aware of this concern. The individual has also moved to another unit since this concern was reported.

22.	Person states he sent an open records request to OCO new mailing address in mid-December and he received a response from DOC saying they are going to search their records. States his request is "1.) OCO investigation of use of force incident involving himself at Airway Heights 2.) 2021 investigation relating to his back injury and lack of medical treatment" asks that OCO not withhold or redact medical records or personal information. States he may have mailed it to the wrong address. States he will re-mail the request to Office of the Corrections Ombuds	This request for records was escalated to the OCO public records team.	Information Provided
23.	Person is requesting transfer to a specific facility to be closer to his mother who is experiencing health complications.	The OCO reviewed recently approved custody facility plans and the individual was approved for transfer. This office provided the individual with this information and that he can appeal within 5 days if he disagrees.	Information Provided
24.	Incarcerated individual reports DOC is not providing him with access to a computer for his pending legal cases and are telling him the cases do not meet the criteria to be considered for priority law library access. The individual has priority access for a federal case, but it expires soon. The computer in his area does not have the same access and he needs to access the law library. The individual called the OCO prior to filing a resolution request, stating that the resolution department would not resolve the issue in time to meet the court required deadline.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO reviewed the concern and verified DOC was providing the individual access to the Law Library, however the individual was not following the process to request access to the Law Library. Individuals are required to request access to the Law Library by kiting the law librarian and signing up for that day.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
25.	The incarcerated individual is housed in a unit that has dry cells and individuals must use the bathrooms located downstairs. At the time this person needed to use the restroom, all the bathrooms were occupied. However, there are some bathrooms upstairs for emergency use. The individual utilized an upstairs bathroom and was given a minor	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. This office spoke with DOC staff in the individual's unit who reported that individuals are required to use the restroom closest to their assigned cell. If an individual has an emergency, they are required to notify the floor officers of their need to use the other restroom. The OCO reviewed the infraction the individual received and found that	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate

	<p>infraction. The person reports that there is a policy regarding upstairs bathroom use, and they should not have been infringed.</p>	<p>he was reported to be talking with other individuals on the upper tier, and when he realized officers were watching him, he went into the bathroom.</p>
<p>26. An external person is writing on behalf of their loved one who has been housed in administrative segregation for over a month. The person says their loved one has not received an infraction and does not understand why they are still in segregation.</p>	<p>DOC policy 320.000 IV. (A) states that, if the individual is retained on Ad Seg status for more than 30 days, one of the following actions will occur 3. Transfer to a more appropriate facility/unit, including an out-of-state facility, which may enhance possible return to a general housing assignment. The DOC reported that this person was found guilty of two infractions which resulted in a facility separation. This person was housed in administrative segregation while the investigation occurred, and the transfer was completed. This person is no longer in segregation and has been transferred to another facility.</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy</p>
<p>27. A loved one expressed concerns about an incarcerated individual receiving an infraction for which they dispute the evidence.</p>	<p>The OCO reviewed the infraction and appeal packet and found there was evidence to substantiate the infraction per DOC's "some" evidence standard.</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy</p>
<p>28. Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about purchasing a note pad and manila envelopes from commissary that then tested positive for spice and suboxone. They also expressed concerns about the mobile test kits.</p>	<p>The OCO reviewed the infraction and find there is evidence to substantiate the infraction as the suspicious strips of paper tested positive for drugs. The individual also has several past drug/alcohol related infractions. Per DOC form 05-093 and DOC policy 460.000 an incarcerated individual does not have a right to other supplemental tests or examine physical evidence.</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy</p>
<p>29. Person reports that his facility risk management team (FRMT) meeting was held to create his custody facility plan (CFP), without him being there or without notifying him first. The FRMT asked for an override he does not want.</p>	<p>The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. DOC 300.380 B states that "The FRMT will include, at minimum: 1. individual, unless participation is waived, or it is an emergent/priority transfer". This individual was enrolled in the Drug Offense Sentencing Alternative program and in the Graduated Reentry program and was terminated due to infractions, which DOC viewed as an "emergent/priority transfer" situation.</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy</p>
<p>30. Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about a 709 infraction for out of bounds for someone else coming into their cell and believes since it was their own cell, the other individual should be infringed, not them.</p>	<p>The OCO reviewed the infraction narrative and find there is evidence to substantiate the infraction as video that was reviewed by two officers shows the individual bring someone into their cell and the individual admits to not securing their cell.</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy</p>

<p>31. Person attempted to file a resolution request regarding the lack of masking while eating meals at mainline and proposed a solution to revert back to grab-and-go-meals. The response from the resolution specialist indicated that the resolution request would not be accepted, and that DOC does not have control over mask mandates. Person says the grievance itself was never acknowledged and the appeal was not accepted.</p>	<p>The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO verified that this resolution request was responded to at the facility level, and that it was appealed and responded to by DOC Headquarters. DOC Headquarters stated that CDC guidelines are outside of their jurisdiction, and cited the Resolution Program Manual, which states “only concerns for Department-related incidents, policies, or practices over which the Department has jurisdiction can be submitted”. The current DOC Routine Masking Guidance (version 7) states that masks are not required in indoor congregate care settings when the community infection levels are low.</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy</p>
<p>32. An external person reports their loved one has been housed in segregation for nearly two months and does not know why. The incarcerated person has expressed that he does not get weekly updates and has not seen anyone since he was served with his infraction. He was also told there is a custody facility plan (CFP) in place, but the plan was not explained to him.</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy. Policy 320.000 IV. (A) If the individual is retained on Ad Seg status for more than 30 days, one of the following actions will occur 3. Transfer to a more appropriate facility/unit, including an out-of-state facility, which may enhance possible return to a general housing assignment. The DOC reported that this person was found guilty of two infractions which resulted in a facility separation. This person was housed in administrative segregation while the investigation occurred, and the transfer was completed. This person is no longer in segregation and has been transferred to another facility.</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy</p>
<p>Cedar Creek Corrections Center</p>		
<p>33. The incarcerated individual reports they received an infraction and then a week later were infraacted again for another positive UA result. This person reports that they should not have received a second test within a week because the UA would still be dirty.</p>	<p>The OCO provided assistance by contacting DOC leadership and getting the individual’s second infraction dismissed.</p>	<p>Assistance Provided</p>
<p>34. Person reports being infraacted for a urine analysis (UA) test and was found guilty. Person appealed the infraction and wanted it dismissed because the corrections officer wrote the wrong bunk number and wrong date for the hearing.</p>	<p>DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO reviewed this person’s record and saw no UA related infractions on file, indicating that DOC dismissed the infraction.</p>	<p>DOC Resolved</p>
<p>35. A loved one of the incarcerated individual reports that they are trying to get information on Extended Family Visits</p>	<p>The OCO provided information regarding the individual’s GRE denial. The individual was denied initially and later screened by the</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>

(EFVs) and Graduated Reentry (GRE). The loved one reports that the individual applied for GRE, but they have not heard anything. The loved one also reports that they have tried to contact DOC staff regarding EFVs but have not received any information.

Headquarters Community Screening Committee and the denial was upheld per DOC 390.590, Graduated Reentry. This office also provided information regarding how the individual's loved one may apply for EFVs through the DOC website.

<p>36. Incarcerated individual reports there has been no water in their unit and the facility has lice. DOC treated the individual and the rest of the unit, but the lice came back. The individual reports that he was the last one to receive a new mattress due to him being housed in segregation for a short period of time. The Individual reports the main issue he is having is that every time he files a resolution request, DOC issues him an infraction. Person requests the OCO investigate this matter specifically as the others has been resolved.</p>	<p>The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO reviewed the individual's resolution requests and compared them to the dates of infractions received and found the resolution requests were filed after the infractions were issued. The OCO alerted facility leadership about the water issue and DOC explained they were aware and working to remedy the concerns. At this time the water is restored.</p>	<p>Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate</p>
<p>37. Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about reporting a concern about hazardous conditions through a grievance and then being transferred to another facility. The individual feels like they are being transferred due to writing the grievance, but the facility is saying they were transferred due to their medical code while the individual reports they are perfectly healthy.</p>	<p>The concern about the change in medical code was already reviewed by this office previously. The OCO found there is no evidence of a correlation between the change in transfer and the grievance about the hazardous conditions, as a result there is no evidence of retaliation as the individual was transferred due to their medical needs.</p>	<p>Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate</p>
<p>38. Incarcerated individual reports he was denied Graduated Reentry (GRE) based on a community concern regarding a no contact order. The individual reports the victim is in another county than the one he would have released to. The individual does not agree with his GRE decision and requests the OCO review the decision.</p>	<p>The OCO was unable to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO reviewed the reasons for the individuals GRE denial and verified per DOC 390.590 Graduated Reentry, "Graduated Reentry transfer orders will be screened by a Graduated Reentry CS4, who will determine participation eligibility and document in the electronic file. 1. DOC 11-042 Request for Denial of Graduated Reentry will be used to document denials of eligibility for electronic home monitoring. 2. The Classification Unit will confirm all denials. 3. Denials that are not policy-driven, or those that warrant additional review, will be scheduled for Headquarters Community Screening Committee (HCSC) review using DOC 07-026 Formal Headquarters Community Screening</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy</p>

Committee (HCSC)/Life Without Parole Decision.” In this individual’s situation, the GRE application was sent to the HCSC for review and was denied to due safety concerns in the community.

<p>39. External Individual reports DOC denied her and her incarcerated loved one Extended Family Visits (EFVs). The external individual lives very far away and EFVs are necessary for then to have time together. DOC denied them EFVs because of an anti-harassment order that was deemed a like relationship to the external individual. External individual reports DOC denied the EFV incorrectly and requests the denial be overturned.</p>	<p>The OCO was able to substantiate this concern. The OCO found the basis of the EFV denial DOC used to deny the visits was incorrect and the EFVs should not have been denied. DOC agreed to share this with the external individual and her loved one. Unfortunately, the incarcerated individual was infractioned during this investigation, which denies him access to EFV’s for one year. This denial reason is unrelated to the initial denial. The OCO explained to the incarcerated individual that him and his loved one may re-apply for EFVs after one year.</p>	<p>Substantiated</p>
---	---	----------------------

Clallam Bay Corrections Center

<p>40. External person reports that their loved one is not being allowed to level up while in segregation. They are in segregation for protective custody.</p>	<p>The OCO reviewed the individual’s custody facility plan and contacted the DOC classifications to discuss this concern. After discussion, his placement was reviewed, and he was moved to a safe harbor in close custody.</p>	<p>Assistance Provided</p>
<p>41. Person states he received a BOE for appealing mail rejections. He requested to speak to staff on kiosk and was denied. When he appealed mail rejections again and BOE he was infractioned for the photos that were rejected and that he was appealing the rejection of. He was found guilty of the sexually explicit materials and states the pictures he received are not sexually explicit. During the hearing he was accused of numerous things that were not listed in the infraction to rationalize finding him guilty. He feels the infraction was in retaliation for appealing the mail rejection.</p>	<p>The OCO reviewed the infraction, negative BOE, and mail rejections. After review, this office asked the facility for a second review by the DOC. BOEs are to be factual and should not contain opinions, conclusions, conjectures, or judgments about the documented behavior. The negative BOE was amended per policy to reflect the negative behavior. The facility did agree to dismiss the infraction, which has now been removed from the record. The individual was not demoted over these incidents. The DOC is still upholding the mail rejections as they viewed the photos as sexually explicit.</p>	<p>Assistance Provided</p>
<p>42. Person states they were found guilty of attempting to bring in contraband by mail and since the hearing their loved one has been in segregation. The prison has blocked any form of contact between themselves and the incarcerated loved one.</p>	<p>The OCO was able to provide information regarding DOC 450.300 VII Denial, Suspension or Termination of visits and the information on how to appeal decision located in DOC 450.300 X Appeals.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>

<p>43. Person was told that when DOC switched phone providers that existing funds would be transferred to the new account as well. The funds were not moved to the new account and person is missing over \$1000 from the old account. Person has not been able to get a solid answer from DOC staff to where the money is or how to get a refund.</p>	<p>The OCO provided information on how to contact Securus customer service to locate the individual's missing funds. Incarcerated individuals can call Securus' hotline for incarcerated individuals at 1-855-273-7292. If they have family or friends who can help, they can also call Securus' customer service line at 1-800-844-6591 or 972-734-1111. The OCO also reached out to JPay, who acknowledged issues in the transition to Securus, and encouraged patience as the transition rolls out.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>44. The incarcerated individual reports concerns with access to the law library. The individual reports that they are denied adequate and equal time in the satellite law library for the Safe Harbor unit. The individual reports that there is not a law librarian on staff, which makes wait times for documents excessive and he reports that the legal materials are out of date.</p>	<p>The OCO provided information regarding the satellite law library. This office spoke with the law librarian at the facility, who confirmed that individuals are able to attend the law library once a day for at least one hour. If an individual need to request documents or legal materials, they may kite the law librarian who confirmed that the materials will be available in one or two days after the request was sent. Legal materials are updated quarterly for all law libraries in the facility; however, individuals may also request the most recent version of legal materials from the law librarian which will be available for viewing for up to two weeks.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>45. Person states they are on an extended-release medication and medical staff are opening the medication and floating it in water. He states there is no policy stating this is the way medication must be administered.</p>	<p>The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO contacted Health Services management who informed this office that the medication the patient is on is immediate release dose form. DOC also confirmed that facility has a crush and float order for that specific medication, signed by the Director of Pharmacy.</p>	<p>Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate</p>
<p>46. Person transferred and property went missing, including headphones, keyboard, pitcher, shoes, photos, and other accessories. Person filed a resolution request and never received a response. The resolution specialist at the new facility sent it to CBCC. Person has record of major consumables checks but he never received the property.</p>	<p>The OCO contacted the property staff at the individual's current and former facility. The individual has had all property shipped to them and it has been given to them. The specific items the individual expressed concern about have been missing for several years and were not with the individual at their former facility. Additionally, the individual did not grieve this concern until several months after the incident which is outside the 30-day window required for grievances. The individual was informed they can file a tort claim regarding the lost property.</p>	<p>Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate</p>
<p>Coyote Ridge Corrections Center</p>		
<p>47. The incarcerated individual reports that count lights are being left on after count has cleared. The individual</p>	<p>The OCO provided assistance. This office spoke with facility leadership who reviewed the protocol of count lights being turned out once</p>	<p>Assistance Provided</p>

reports this is causing headaches and sleep disruptions. The individual reports that the OCO has investigated this concern before and it was remedied for a while, but the count lights are being left on again.

count has cleared with facility staff. The OCO also spoke with the Correctional Captain at the facility who reviewed video footage to substantiate the individual's concern and has spoken with officers on the standard of when count lights are to be turned off and reports that he will continue to monitor the situation.

48. Individual reported that a DOC staff member showed a large group of incarcerated individuals this individual's criminal charges inside of his office. After that, the large group of individuals threatened to riot and harm him, and he was placed in IMU awaiting transfer.	The OCO contacted the facility after receiving this concern and asked for a full review of video evidence to support this claim. After the video evidence was reviewed, the DOC launched an internal investigation. This individual was then transferred to WSP where he asked for protective custody. The OCO reviewed his custody facility plan and contacted DOC HQ Classifications and asked if he could be transferred to a different facility for his safety. The DOC agreed to transfer him to a safe harbor.	Assistance Provided
49. Person reports issues starting about three weeks ago. DOC took away his tablet when he went to get his earphones. He was told he would be written up for a major infraction and the tablet was being sent as evidence. Last night he was infractioned for having a third blanket, which he had been provided for cold weather. He was infractioned for the blanket. He said his hearing is tomorrow. He is concerned the officers are targeting him with small things and he is afraid he will be removed from the pod. He is afraid of retaliation.	OCO staff were able to provide self-advocacy information to the complainant at the time of the call to the OCO hotline to address the concern.	Information Provided
50. The relative of an incarcerated individual requested information about how to get her relative transferred to a facility that is closer to his family.	The OCO provided the relative with the contact information of the head of classifications at DOC.	Information Provided
51. The incarcerated individual reports concerns regarding the facility not allowing people of different custody levels to attend the Law Library together. The individual reports that someone from a different custody level is helping him with his legal work, but due to the current cohorting schedule, he has not been able to get assistance from this person.	The OCO provided information regarding the facility's cohorting requirements. DOC staff confirmed that they facility has worked on a normal schedule and a cohort schedule so that they can be flexible based upon the facility status as well as the county color. If the county and the facility are in green status, cross-cohorting will be allowed. If that changes, the facility will need to separate individuals based on their custody level.	Information Provided
52. Person reports that DOC put out a memo saying that individuals would be	The OCO provided information regarding the DOC memos. All purchased content from the old	Information Provided

allowed to send their old JPay players to family or would be stored by Securus until release. After Securus got the JPay players, DOC put out another memo stating that all old JPay players must be surrendered to Securus. Person feels this is fraud and theft and filed a resolution request regarding the issue. DOC acknowledged that they gave out misinformation and are still taking the old JPay players.

player will be transferred to the new Securus tablet. Upon release, individuals will receive their purchased music on a USB drive and their fully refurbished tablet with nothing on it. The OCO is continuing to monitor the transition from JPay to Securus.

<p>53. Person submitted complaint regarding the distribution of the new tablets. Person says they elected the option to send out their JP5 tablet to friends/family to receive the new JP6 player.</p>	<p>Per DOC Memo dated January 13, 2023, DOC states that on January 10th a distributed memo gave misinformation about surrendering the old tablets. The new memo states that after further discussion with Securus it was determined the old tablets must be returned. All purchased content and messages will be transferred to the new player. Individuals will have until August 1, 2023, to provide Securus with an address for a tablet that is refurbished (with nothing on it) to be mailed. The memo also states that no one will receive their original tablet back.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>54. Person reports there was a hunger strike at Coyote Ridge Corrections Center in 2018 for multiple reasons, including allowing people to TVs in their rooms. DOC then agreed to allow four TVs in four person cells. Person reports that DOC recently sent out a memo that two TVs per cell would be taken out because of an L&I concern about staff tripping over TV cords.</p>	<p>The OCO provided information regarding this ongoing issue at Coyote Ridge Corrections Center. This is an active conversation at DOC that the OCO is monitoring, and it has not been resolved yet. The DOC is currently negotiating what to do with the TVs and cords in four person rooms.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>55. Person reports that he was released on Graduated Reentry (GRE) last year and that his case worker went to his Oxford House and then arrested him at this job site. Person's brother went to the Oxford House and found that all his things were gone, including a box of cash totaling almost \$1000. Person feels the case worker should have secured the box before leaving the house because he was still in DOC custody.</p>	<p>The OCO provided information about filing a tort claim. DOC 120.500 states "All incarcerated individual tort claims alleging personal property damage/loss must be filed by the individual with the Washington State Department of Enterprise Services (DES) Risk Management Division".</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>56. Person reports they were supposed to be hired in the kitchen, but a DOC staff member called and said not to hire him because he is argumentative and</p>	<p>The OCO provided information regarding the individual being screened to work in the kitchen. They will need to be interviewed before obtaining a position per conversation with their counselor.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>

disruptive. He has grieved this, but DOC said this issue is not grievable.

57. The incarcerated individual reports that the DOC withheld funds from his COVID-19 stimulus check. The individual thought that the DOC was not allowed to do that.	The OCO provided information regarding allowed deductions from stimulus checks. Per RCW 9.94A.760, stimulus payments are subject to deductions outlined in DOC 200.000, Attachment 3, Deductions. The second stimulus payment was exempt from deductions by a federal mandate; however, the exemption does not apply to the first or third stimulus payments.	Information Provided
58. Person was timed out of their CI job per policy and the person has been without a job. Person says a staff member has allowed other incarcerated people to work beyond the seven-year timeframe.	The OCO was able to provide information regarding DOC 700.00 Work Program assignment and how to appeal for a time extension.	Information Provided
59. The incarcerated individual reports that the facility has not provided the requested complete medical file to the Department of Veteran's Affairs, which could affect his veteran's benefits.	The OCO provided information regarding who he may contact if he has questions about Veterans Affairs (VA). The individual may speak with his classification counselor who can connect him to facility staff who are familiar with VA related issues and concerns.	Information Provided
60. Incarcerated individual reports DOC has denied his loved one visitation because of an infraction that was dismissed. The individual reports that the visitor was not involved in the infraction and DOC is reporting that she was. The individual reports that this is another visitor, but DOC is denying them visitation.	The OCO provided information regarding the status of the visitor's application. The OCO reviewed recent visitors' applications and found the visitor has not applied for visitation in two years. The OCO was unable to locate evidence to support that another visitor was denied based on the infraction. The OCO provided information to the individual about how to re-apply for visitation and encouraged them to appeal the decision if denied. The OCO also shared with the individual per DOC 450.300 Visits for Incarcerated Individuals, "Visitors who receive notification that their opportunities for appeal have been exhausted may re-submit an application after one year to be considered for restoration of modified or full visit privileges."	Information Provided
61. A loved one reports that an incarcerated individual's money on his GTL phone account is not being transferred to his new Securus account.	The OCO provided information on how to contact Securus customer service to locate the individual's missing funds. Incarcerated individuals can call Securus' hotline for incarcerated individuals at 1-855-273-7292. If they have family or friends who can help, they can also call Securus' customer service line at 1-800-844-6591 or 972-734-1111. The OCO also reached out to JPay, who acknowledged issues in the transition to Securus, and encouraged patience as the transition takes place.	Information Provided

62. External Person reported unwanted harassment/inappropriate contact of a current C/O on behalf of an incarcerated person.	The OCO contacted the facility and asked for a review of this concern as a specific date was listed in the complaint. Video footage was pulled of the incident reported the OCO could not substantiate that this staff member is following this individual around. The OCO could not find any infractions or negative BOEs to confirm harassment by the staff member reported or any other DOC staff. In addition, a resolution request has never been filed against this staff member by this individual citing staff misconduct.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
63. The incarcerated individual wants to remain anonymous and is reporting an incident that happened to someone else. The incarcerated individual was sent to the IMU.	The OCO followed up on the IMU placement. The individual was served an infraction and refused to move from the IMU back to the general population at this facility. He will be transferring from this facility to a medium GP population. The OCO could not find a violation of DOC 320.200	No Violation of Policy
64. Person reported feeling his rights were violated by DOC COVID protocols. Person described emotional, mental health, physical, and educational impacts from lack of visits, sedentary lifestyle, less recreation, unsanitary conditions, increase in violence that resulted from the DOC COVID protocols. Person reported being denied access to religious practices including sweat lodge, smudging, pipe ceremonies, and drum circles and reports that his Native American religious sect was singled out by being the only religious group made to take COVID rapid tests to participate in religious activities.	The OCO reached out to the chaplain at this facility and substantiated that sweat lodges were suspended from spring of 2020 to summer of 2021, and that the sweat lodge is currently the only religious gathering made to take COVID rapid tests, due to the higher risk for COVID transmission in the sweat lodge. The OCO acknowledges the impact on incarcerated individuals' wellbeing from the DOC COVID protocols. The OCO monitored DOC's actions throughout the pandemic and verified that they were operating within CDC guidelines for congregate care settings.	Substantiated

Larch Corrections Center

65. Person reports appealing infraction last year, submitted appeal in March 2022. Grieved that they have not heard back regarding infraction. Never got receipt or anything. Counselor confirmed that appeal is still pending. Infraction was at Larch Corrections Center. Lost good time over this infraction.	DOC entered an appeal finding before the OCO began an investigation into this concern.	DOC Resolved
66. A mother reports complaints with community corrections officers that visited and inspected her home and wants her incarcerated son to be released to her home.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. This office reviewed the release plan and read the Community Corrections Officer's report denying this address and found their actions consistent with DOC's Transition and Release	No Violation of Policy

Policy 350.200 V. Field Process for release plans, particularly regarding community safety concerns. The OCO confirmed that they are working on a new release plan.

67. Person's loved one reports that a potential release address has been denied.	After review of the person's complaint and DOC documents it is determined that there is no violation of policy. Per DOC 350.200 Transition and Release (V) Field Process for Release (B)(1) Review release plan for risk of contact with victims and persons of similar age or circumstance based on individuals' criminal history using available resources, considering protection orders, sex offenses, and victims of domestic violence, child abuse, or other family violence. This office also reviewed the appeal process for Transition and Release address denial, it is the OCO's suggestion that the person finds a new address to be reviewed for the person's release. DOC will not authorize release to the desired county.	No Violation of Policy
--	---	------------------------

68. The incarcerated individual reports that he tried to send drawings through the mailroom, but they were rejected due to there not being a recreation specialist to send art through. The individual says that the rejection said that he was asking the recipient to release the drawings for sale on a third-party social media page, but he reports that he wanted them to be released on his own social media page.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. This office reviewed the individual's mail rejection and spoke with DOC staff who confirmed that the reason for the rejection was per DOC 450.100, Mail for Individuals in Prison, Attachment 1, Unauthorized Mail, reason 40, "Contains correspondence/property for or from a third party." The OCO confirmed with the DOC that third party does include social media.	No Violation of Policy
---	---	------------------------

Monroe Correctional Complex

69. Patient states he injured his ankle at yard time. He feels the nurses' made decisions that led to treatment being delayed. He was seen, the doctor is saying it will heal on its own. He is still having pain.	The OCO provided assistance by contacting Health Services management to request additional imaging or consultation on the patient's pain. Additional imaging was not clinically indicated, the provider did agree to submit the patient's case to the orthopedic specialist for consultation. There was no evidence to support a delay in evaluation of this injury. The patient was instructed to sign up for sick call if his symptoms persisted after the injury per the provider who ordered the other interventions. The patient was seen at sick call and the imaging was ordered by the on-call provider. The availability of the Radiology technician affected the timeliness of the imaging.	Assistance Provided
--	---	---------------------

70. The incarcerated individual reports issues with over-censorship of publications being	The OCO provided assistance. This office spoke with DOC HQ staff responsible for all facility	Assistance Provided
---	---	---------------------

sent to him. The individual reports that he can understand some of the rejections that he has received but feels others are excessive. He reports that he had a publication written in another language that was rejected but he doesn't understand why. He feels that the mailroom is not following policy on some of the rejections.

mailrooms who confirmed that the facility did not follow the process outlined in DOC 450.100, Mail for Individuals in Prison. Per policy, publications in other languages should be sent to the manager, but instead the facility disposed of the publication. DOC HQ staff reviewed the process with the facility mailroom staff to ensure the correct process is followed going forward. The OCO provided the individual with information on tort claims, as well as a contact at DOC HQ who confirmed they will provide a formal response for the individual to include in a tort claim.

<p>71. Patient states that he was diagnosed with cancer and was not able to speak to his provider for months after transferring. He received the surgery he needed but did not receive follow up from his primary provider. He has kited several times and contacted the Patient Care Navigator to try to resolve the problem but was not able to get a resolution. He is requesting a meeting with the Facility Medical Director and Health Services Manager to discuss the cause of the delay in getting seen by his primary care provider.</p>	<p>The OCO provided assistance to the patient by contacting the Health Services Manager and requesting that the Facility Medical Director and Health Services Manager meet with the patient to discuss his concerns.</p>	<p>Assistance Provided</p>
<p>72. The incarcerated individual reports that he had letters sent to him in another language and they sat in the mailroom for several months because they were not being translated. The individual reports that there is a certain timeframe for the DOC to translate letters and believes that the policy was violated.</p>	<p>The OCO provided assistance. This office reviewed DOC 450.100, Mail for Individuals in Prison, and confirmed that mail requiring translation will not be held for more than five business days per policy. The OCO spoke with the DOC HQ staff responsible for all facility mailrooms who reported that the facility was not following the correct process for mail requiring translation. The DOC HQ staff re-trained the mailroom staff at the individual's facility on the process for mail requiring translation and sent a memorandum to all facilities to remind them of the process.</p>	<p>Assistance Provided</p>
<p>73. Incarcerated individual reports he is being held past his earned release date (ERD) because he meets the for civil commitment. The individual is having a hard time understanding how the civil commitment process affects his release because DOC staff are telling him he will have to stay past his ERD because he is pending civil commitment. The individual is requesting information about how to have</p>	<p>The OCO provided assistance. The OCO verified the individual is past his release date, pending civil commitment and found no release plans in his file. The OCO reviewed DOC 350.200 Transition and Release which states, "For individuals referred for civil commitment, email doceosr@doc1.wa.gov to request a copy of any available Forensic Psychological Evaluation (FPE) and ensure all relevant information is scanned into the electronic imaging file for review.</p>	<p>Assistance Provided</p>

a release plan reviewed for possible approval and what the process is when someone is pending civil commitment that is past their ERD.

1) Static and dynamic risk factors relating to the individual's risk to the community will be considered and documented in the electronic file, including whether the individual is able to address any concerns.

2) The release plan must meet the community safety requirements outlined in the FPE.

a) Plans will not be denied based solely on not having a completed FPE and will be reviewed to determine if the plan is appropriate." The OCO shared this process with the individual's classification counselor and they agreed to explain this to the individual and work with him on options for potential release. The OCO substantiates that release planning was not being addressed prior to OCO involvement.

<p>74. Individual reports he is being held in the intensive management unit (IMU) pending transfer for multiple months with no information about why the transfer is taking so long. The individual reports his family has called DOC multiple times and DOC does not share any information with them. The individual wants to be transferred to release from IMU.</p>	<p>The OCO provided assistance. The OCO spoke with DOC staff who shared that the facility has been experiencing transfer delays due to chain bus issues. Shortly after the OCO spoke with DOC, the individual was transferred and is now in general population.</p>	<p>Assistance Provided</p>
<p>75. The incarcerated individual reports that he filed a resolution request regarding staff misconduct and was informed that an administrative investigation is being conducted. The resolution request response said that the individual would receive information on the outcome of the investigation, but he reports that he never did.</p>	<p>The OCO provided assistance. This office contacted the DOC Headquarters Resolution Department who identified that an error was made with the statement that an outcome of the investigation would be provided. The outcome of an administrative investigation is generally not shared with the individual who raised the concerns, however, due to the error, the individual was provided with the outcome of the investigation.</p>	<p>Assistance Provided</p>
<p>76. The Individual reports that DOC staff are being rude and disrespectful. This person is trying to address his custody facility plan and custody points.</p>	<p>The OCO reviewed this complaint regarding staff behavior with DOC leadership at the facility. The DOC took internal measures that addressed the staff member's behavior. The DOC will do a new classification review to determine his placement.</p>	<p>Assistance Provided</p>
<p>77. Person was transferred back to medium, and now he cannot access law library. He has two court deadlines. He is having issues with officers shining lights in his room at night. He says he did not do anything to get into medium; he claims he was infraacted in retaliation for filing grievances. One infraction was</p>	<p>The OCO reviewed the two infractions and had some concerns about the individual being notified about the first infraction before issuing the second. As a result, the OCO contacted DOC and DOC agreed to overturn the second infraction.</p>	<p>Assistance Provided</p>

dismissed and the other should have been dismissed. His concern is that he should not have been moved to TRU and the infractions that lead him there are false.

78.	Patient reports concerns about being denied a Health Status Report (HSR) for thermals that was previously approved by the Care Review Committee (CRC).	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO reviewed the patient's current, active HSRs and found an approved HSR for thermals on file for 2023-2024.	DOC Resolved
79.	Person states that he needs help getting his counselor and medical to listen to him and check the RFID chip he put in his leg. Person states that he put the RFID chip in his left leg over 10 years ago and that it is now making him dizzy.	The OCO provided information about kiting health services. The OCO also encouraged the person to file a resolution request if he is concerned with how he is being treated by staff. 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
80.	Person reports current shoes supplied by DOC smell and should not be worn. Person states that they have requested shoes and has not received the shoes. Person grieved the issue and was told there was nothing wrong with the shoes. The shoes are causing the person pain, they have athletes' foot due to the state of the shoes. Person must wear sandals just to air out their feet because the tennis shoes are grotesque.	The OCO provided information on how to request new shoes from the property room at the facility. Individual was instructed to send a kiosk message to the property room in order to request a new pair of shoes.	Information Provided
81.	Person reports loved one is going to be moved to CRCC. If he was closer to home, family would be able to support and motivate him into getting his life back on track.	The OCO provided information regarding Facility Assignment and Transfers. Per DOC 300.380 VI Facility Assignment and Transfers A. Determining facility placement will be consistent with department needs and (2.) meet requirements of the individual's custody level designation and health service's needs. C. Transfers will be approved by Headquarters classifications unit and are final.	Information Provided
82.	The incarcerated individual reports that his resolution requests are being blocked and he is not being allowed to appeal to level III.	The OCO provided information regarding the status of the resolution requests the individual had concerns about and information on the Resolution Program Manual. This office reviewed the resolution requests that the individual mentioned in his concern, and found that two were being processed at level III, one was past 30 days of the incident, and one was not accepted as the individual had five active	Information Provided

	resolution requests at the time of submission, as outlined in the Resolution Program Manual.		
83.	Incarcerated individual reports she had a new hearing and presented the evidence that was previously withheld and was still found guilty. She was demoted to max custody. They are talking about sending her out of state. She was transferred to another facility then denied placement in a GP setting. She feels that this is transphobic retaliation.	The OCO previously reviewed this infraction and asked the DOC for a review. After the review the DOC issued a new hearing. She was found guilty again and is currently housed in solitary confinement. She was recently denied placement in general population. However, after further discussion, the DOC has decided to rescreen her. The DOC is not in violation of policy 320.250 by keeping her in max custody.	Information Provided
84.	Individual reports a mental health diagnosis and need for access to specific mental health medications. DOC mental health staff have told him that these are not approved medications for DOC, and he cannot have them.	The OCO was able to provide information regarding how to request a mental health appointment to discuss medication options and/or Non-Formulary Review for medications. DOC 630.500 II Access to Care A. (2) Self-Referral (a.) Individuals under the Departments Jurisdiction may request mental health services by: (1) Submitting DOC 13-423 Health Services Kite. If the patient receives an appointment and is still struggling to access medications, they can file a resolution request to level I and follow up with the OCO.	Information Provided
85.	The incarcerated individual reports that recent changes in policies limit the types of job the individual is allowed to work. The individual reports that they lost their job as a result of this policy change and change to the individual's PREA score.	The OCO provided information regarding how the individual may have his PREA score reviewed. This office confirmed that the individual is has several referrals for other jobs, and recommended he continue to work with his counselor to find a suitable position.	Information Provided
86.	The incarcerated individual reports that he has been working resolving an issue with the mailroom for over three months. The individual received photocopies of pictures sent in by mail and the following day the individual grieved the situation and has received different and conflicting responses. The individual tried to have the original items that were photocopied sent back out or be received by him per policy and subsequent memo, but it appeals the mailroom either lost or destroyed the items and did not keep a record of them.	The OCO provided information regarding the individual's photos being retained for 15 days, and then being destroyed after the individual did not request for them to be sent out within that time period. This office verified that a new process has been implemented in attempt to prevent this type of issue from occurring in the future.	Information Provided
87.	Patient reports that DOC medical is not following recommendations from the outside specialist. He was supposed to get an increase in medication and a knee sleeve and has received neither.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. OCO staff reviewed the consult report and found no evidence that the requested resolution was recommended by the outside provider. OCO staff also contacted Health Services Management to follow up after an additional specialist appointment and were	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate

	informed that no further follow up was indicated for that issue.	
88. Person reports he lost his dad a few months ago and had a bad conversation with a counselor while his family was on the phone. The person grieved this, and DOC determined that this should be investigated by PREA. The person has been retaliated against; staff gave him three major infractions.	The OCO has reviewed this concern and has not found documented evidence available to verify that DOC staff behavior meets the definition of retaliation. To substantiate retaliation, the OCO must be able to prove that a negative action from a DOC staff member is not only linked close in time to an incarcerated individual's protected action but there must be evidence of a clear relationship between the two acts.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
89. A loved one reports that her visits with an incarcerated individual were terminated because DOC states she was involved with the introduction of contraband, and that the termination was upheld after exhausting all appeals. The loved one reports that the incarcerated individual is being targeted and harassed by DOC staff and that they did not introduce contraband into the facility.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO reviewed the appeal and appeal termination, as well as the two infractions related to the introduction of contraband. In the infraction summary, DOC had video and audio evidence to substantiate the introduction of contraband through a visit and by mail. DOC 450.300 VIII. B. states that "Persons identified as being involved in attempting/conspiring to introduce, or aiding and abetting another to introduce contraband, in any way, will have their visit privileges suspended or terminated".	No Violation of Policy
90. Person states that she was denied strip search by a female officer and was searched by three men. When she requested a female officer, she was told that TRU is not considering doing that. She has spoken to leadership and was told that they are not going to ask female staff to do the strip searches.	The OCO reviewed the complaint and determined there is No Violation of Policy. When there is no female officer available to perform the search DOC is within policy to have a male officer complete the search. Per DOC 490.700 IX (B) search preferences will be documented on the individual's DOC 02-420 Preference Request. (1) Searches will be conducted in accordance with the stated preference unless circumstances do not allow for the preference to be implemented during a pat or strip search. (a) if unable to accommodate the request in Prisons and reentry centers, the shift commander/duty office will consider appropriate alternatives. 1) When a pat/strip search is not conducted according to the DOC 02-420 Preference Request, an Incident Management Reporting System (IMRS) report will be completed.	No Violation of Policy
91. A loved one of the incarcerated individual reports that the individual was given four urine tests within one month. The loved one reports that they feel the individual is being targeted by DOC staff.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. This office found that the individual was tested per DOC 420.380, Drug/Alcohol Testing, which includes testing for cause as well as random drug/alcohol tests. The OCO confirmed	No Violation of Policy

	that the individual was not repeatedly tested after reporting the concern to this office.	
92. Person submitted an OCO Closed Case Review Request and based on new information, the OCO reactivated the case. Person's concern is that they are still unable to access an HSR for a specialized medical diet of no milk and no gluten. The patient also mentioned the Care Review Committee (CRC) declined a requested MRI, unrelated to the specialized diet.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate a violation of policy. DOC confirmed the patient has received allergy testing and results were negative, therefore the individual does not meet the qualifications for a specialized medical diet under DOC 610.240 Therapeutic Diets and Therapeutic Diets Guidelines Attachment 1. There is an active HSR on file for a gluten free diet and the individual can self-select based on the therapeutic guidelines for lactose intolerance. The OCO also provided information about Care Review Committee (CRC) decisions and appeal process.	No Violation of Policy
93. A loved one of the incarcerated individual reports that the individual has a sex offense on his record and is being denied Graduated Reentry. The loved one reports that the individual is a low-level risk because this is their first offense.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. Per DOC 390.590, Graduated Reentry, Individuals with a history of arrests/convictions containing sexual elements will be referred to the Sex Offense Treatment and Assessments Program (SOTAP) unit for additional review and assessment of the individual's risk to commit future sex offenses. The individual was screened by SOTAP, but at the time of the screening was unwilling to participate at the facility and thus deemed not amenable to treatment. Due to the individual's Earned Release Date (ERD), he no longer has time to transfer facilities to complete treatment. Per DOC 570.000, Sex Offence Treatment and Assessment Programs, to be eligible for treatment, qualified individuals should have at least 24 months to their Earned Release Date (ERD) to complete treatment requirements. Individuals with less than 12 months to their ERD will not be considered.	No Violation of Policy
94. Incarcerated individual reports they were supposed to have earned their good time back per the Good Conduct Time (GCT) restoration pathway that was put in place because of infractions he received. GCT restoration pathways are created to allow individuals a way to earn lost GCT back. Every time the individual asks about the GCT restoration pathway DOC staff move the pathway to the next review and do not restore the individual GCT. The individual reports during the time period established	The OCO was unable to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO reviewed the individual's GCT restoration pathway and found the individual has not met the criteria to restore the GCT through the created pathway. The OCO verified that it is common protocol to carry the pathway over to the individual's next review to allow the individual the opportunity to meet the GCT restoration pathway criteria and have the GCT time restored. The criteria in the GCT restoration pathway are compliant with DOC 350.100 Earned Release Time, "Time lost will be restored if the individual: 1. Remains free	No Violation of Policy

in the pathway they complied with the criteria DOC outlined.

from any serious violation, 2. Follows the requirements as outlined in the plan, and 3. It has been at least 6 months since the previous classification review.

95. Incarcerated person requested an Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) cell with accessible shelving and was denied the request for such cell. After he received the denial, the individual was told that his facility would put in a work order to install accessible shelving to his current cell and that has not happened. Person also reports concerns about the unit being overpopulated and not ADA compliant. The individual's requested resolution was to have the work order and shelving completed.	The OCO could not substantiate a violation of policy 840.100 Disability Accommodation and Separation. The OCO contacted the facility ADA Coordinator and DOC reports they could not identify any approved ADA accommodations for shelving. The ADA Coordinator did agree to allow the individual to resubmit the accommodation request since he did not submit an appeal within timeframe. There are at least two resolution requests on file for this issue and DOC's response states the individual has made this request multiple times and has been denied. DOC reports the current shelving is in compliance with ADA standards and ADA accommodations are approved via a statewide committee. There are no maintenance work orders or HQ approvals for additional shelving at this time. After additional review, DOC communicated an error was made on the ASR denial mentioning a local work order being placed, however, since the accommodation was denied, the work order will not be completed.	No Violation of Policy
96. The incarcerated individual reports that he sent legal mail on a Thursday, but it did not go out until Monday. The individual wants to know why the mailroom held his legal mail.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. Per DOC 450.100, Mail for Individuals in Prison, excluding weekends, holidays, or emergency situations, approved mail will be processed in the following timeframes: outgoing first-class mail will not be held for more than 48 hours. Because weekends are excluded from the 48-hour timeframe, mail received by the mailroom on Thursday and sent out on Monday is within policy.	No Violation of Policy
97. The incarcerated individual reports that the cable TV system is not working in the in-patient unit. The individual says that all cells are equipped with cable outlets and the facility claims to have had a work order in since 2019, citing staff shortages for the delay. The individual says that people in the unit are still paying the cable fee and having a TV would be beneficial for individuals in the in-patient unit.	The OCO was able to substantiate this concern. The facility confirmed that that this is a long-standing concern that the DOC is aware of. The facility continues to work on the cable system as they are able and recently brought in a reputable firm to study the cable system and propose a replacement. The facility is currently focusing on repairing the cable in long-term living units as that is where most people spend their time.	Substantiated

98. The incarcerated individual expressed concern about the phone booth near main control being only used to call the OCO, not for private attorney phone calls. The individual reports that they can only call their attorney during certain times in order for it to be private without a line of people waiting for the phones and listening.	The OCO was able to substantiate this concern. The phone booth requires main control to call the OCO number and transfer the call to the booth. Facility staff report that main control has several other duties and does not have the time to manage a calendar or volume of calls to different attorneys.	Substantiated
--	---	---------------

Olympic Corrections Center

99. Incarcerated individual expressed concerns regarding an infraction they received.	The OCO reviewed the infraction and appeal packet and found evidence to substantiate the infraction as per WAC 137-25-030 conspiring to commit an infraction is considered the same as committing the violation.	No Violation of Policy
---	--	------------------------

Stafford Creek Corrections Center

100. Anonymous incarcerated individual reports plumbing issues in their cell.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO spoke to facility staff and found that the issue had not been addressed. The OCO also found the incarcerated individuals were reporting the concern to DOC staff with no response. The OCO alerted DOC staff of the issue and they addressed the plumbing concern and ensured that there is a process in the unit to get facility service issues addressed in a timely manner.	Assistance Provided
---	---	---------------------

101. The incarcerated individual moved facilities and was told he cannot work at Correctional Industries (CI) because he is under the parole board. This person reports that he has lived at several prisons and does not understand what is different at this facility. He has filed a resolution request, which was denied, and believes that the DOC is not making any efforts to help him.	The OCO provided assistance by reviewing this concern and DOC 700.000. While this individual does fall under the board, he does have an Expected Release Date (ERD) and has been eligible to work for CI at other facilities. The OCO then contacted the facility to discuss the CI denial and the Assistant Secretary of Reentry. The DOC agreed to review a new application for CI placement. The application was approved and has now been forwarded to the job placement coordinator.	Assistance Provided
--	---	---------------------

102. An incarcerated individual called to report a concern in the close observation area after hearing someone yelling for help. Person provided the name of the individual and asked the OCO to follow up.	The OCO was able to provide assistance by contacting the facility, requesting, and confirming a wellness check. The patient also communicated additional concerns via phone which the OCO opened new cases for, and the person will receive communication on those cases once the casework is complete.	Assistance Provided
---	---	---------------------

103. The incarcerated individual does not speak English and has been trying to get medical appointments for five months. He is experiencing a challenging language barrier and is requesting correspondence in his language. The OCO advised this person	The OCO provided assistance. DOC staff confirmed that there are Limited English Proficiency (LEP) coordinators at each facility, and they can facilitate the use of an interpreter. The DOC provided a list of staff members and contact information to set up the individual needs of this person prior to their appointment.	Assistance Provided
--	--	---------------------

that DOC has a translation line that can be used during the appointment.

The OCO contacted the LEP coordinator who confirmed that she could provide step-by-step instructions for this person to access Corporate Translation Services (CTS) Language Link. The individual's next step is to send a kite to this staff member and request help with this service.

104. Individual reports he is in IMU even though his infraction was dismissed.	The OCO reviewed the individual's DOC records and IMU placement. The individual had received an infraction for threatening, which was dismissed. After a review of the incident, the DOC still felt that this individual should be transferred out of the facility based on current and past behavior and recommended a prohibited placement, The OCO spoke with classifications and followed up the process of the request for the prohibited placement. The prohibited placement was denied, however his transfer to another facility was approved. His transfer is being processed and he will be returned to general population.	Assistance Provided
105. Incarcerated individual reports he is set to be transferred to another facility and he has safety concern there. The individual has tried to communicate these concerns to DOC staff and is not getting responses. The individual wants to speak with DOC and share their concerns to halt the transfer.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO reached out to DOC staff and alerted them of this concern. The OCO verified that the individual shared the safety concerns with DOC and as a result was not transferred to the facility. DOC created a new plan for the individual and placed him at another facility after OCO contacted with DOC.	Assistance Provided
106. Person states he was referred to dermatology for possible skin cancer. His appointment was cancelled, and he has an unrelated surgery that is on hold until this is resolved.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO contacted Health Services management and were informed the patient was already rescheduled for the dermatology visit. The OCO monitored the case in the appointment tracker for completion and followed up with DOC staff. This office was informed that the schedulers are working on getting the delayed surgery scheduled now that the patient has been cleared by dermatology.	DOC Resolved
107. Person was infracted for refusing to cell in after asking for a resolution request form to grieve a DOC staff member that made unprofessional remarks. Person is disputing the events that took place and the narrative from the infracting officer. Person claims the staff member's actions were misconduct and they misconstrued the whole situation.	The OCO reviewed the infraction, and it has since been removed from the individual's disciplinary record.	DOC Resolved

108. Person reports concerns about hormone access.	Person called the hotline and said they are now getting support from DOC to address hormone access.	DOC Resolved
109. Person reports that his family sent him a package for his birthday, and it arrived at facility on 12/14/22. He has not received his package. He has grieved it and has not been told why he has not received his package.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. After email correspondence with resolution specialist at the facility, the OCO was informed that the individual did receive his package prior to OCO involvement.	DOC Resolved
110. External person reports their loved one had been in excruciating pain for months. They state that they have contacted DOC before to get the patient out to a CT scan, and the patient has not been informed of the results. They are requesting a full MRI to find out what is causing the pain.	The OCO provided information regarding the Health Services outside consult process. The OCO contacted Health Services management and were informed the patient is already scheduled for several outside specialist appointments and had been evaluated by his provider recently with no changes clinically indicated to the patient's treatment and pain management. The clinical appropriateness of any imaging requests must be determined by the ordering provider. The patient's treatment plan will be updated as DOC receives recommendations from the specialist's consults. These recommendations must fall within the coverage of the Health Plan or be presented to the Care Review Committee to be approved.	Information Provided
111. Family member reports they do not feel that their incarcerated loved one is receiving adequate medical treatment.	The OCO provided information to the incarcerated person regarding steps to take if the medical issues they have been having had not been resolved. If they are having new symptoms related to the same issue, individual was advised to send a kite or kiosk message to request a medical appointment. If those steps have been taken, individual may file a grievance and contact the OCO when they receive a response.	Information Provided
112. The incarcerated individual was given a new tablet, and there are issues with Securus. He reports that people are not getting any of their emails through the messaging platform, and when people try to email him, they get an error message. He mentioned that he could email some people, but not everyone would receive the messages. He also reports that he had over 150 songs on his old tablet, which have not been downloaded to his new device.	The OCO provided information about the new Securus tablets. The DOC reported that Securus fixed the messaging issue with individuals housed in the intensive management unit. They also reported that music would be downloaded in phases and should be completed by now. If this person does not have their music, they will need to submit a trouble ticket with Securus.	Information Provided
113. The person reports there are no options for her to go to a men's prison per her	The OCO provided information about this person's current housing decision. Due to	Information Provided

recent facility risk management team (FRMT). She is now in the intensive management unit (IMU). She reports that she is in IMU for an alleged staff assault when she hugged a staff member. She would like to be transferred to the women's prison.

multiple infractions, this individual has been placed in max custody. The DOC has denied her placement at the women's facility. The DOC will continue to review her for possible placement in the future.

<p>114. The incarcerated individual reports that he got demoted from minimum custody to medium. This person has kited the sergeant and asked if he can be moved, and the sergeant told him that he must wait 90 days because he just got a major infraction.</p>	<p>The OCO provided information regarding the policy pertaining to cell/bed moves. Per DOC 420140 IV. Cell/Bed moves B (1.) Requesting individuals must: (c) Have no guilty findings for serious infractions in the 90 days prior to the request.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>115. Person reports he has not received a medication he had approved through the non-formulary review process. He attempted to resolve through medical, but the responses are confusing and they do not seem to understand the person's request.</p>	<p>The OCO provided information to the patient regarding the process to get the requested medication reordered. The patient is currently out of the facility for an extended period. The medication the patient is requesting is affected by a long-term supplier shortage. This impacted the availability of the medication to the patient and DOC is trying to source that medication from multiple suppliers. The OCO notified the Health Services manager of the patient's current assigned facility was made aware of the issue and stated he would attempt to resolve this when then patient returns to the facility.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>116. Individual wants the OCO and AMEND to know that each officer station on the breezeway and in the yards need protective plastic for the doorways to break up the breeze. DOC should create awnings near medical for pill line to protect against weather while people are waiting to go to pill line. DOC should set aside a day from 9am-3pm with DOC officials, AMEND officials, and advisory council to spend time getting to know each other so that trust is built. This means having breakfast and lunch together, sharing stories.</p>	<p>The OCO received, reviewed, and saved this information for future reference.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>117. Person was out on the CPA program and received a violation and went to treatment. He was placed at Stafford Creek Correctional Center. Person asked OCO staff if he goes into custody from the community are they supposed to take him to a different custody level? He was given 50 days and does not think that warrants a</p>	<p>The OCO reviewed the infraction narrative and found there is evidence to substantiate the infraction and see the individual is at the appropriate custody level as the result of the infraction. The OCO informed the individual that they can request another FMRT based on their behavior.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>

person to be housed in prison. Person feels that with the time he got he should be at camp. The OCO staff told him to contact the office during an in-person visit.

118. External Person reports that their loved one has been having trouble with dizziness and vertigo.	The OCO provided information to the patient regarding how to sign up to be seen by a provider. The OCO confirmed that the patient had not filed a resolution request for this issue. The patient must request to be seen and show up to the appointments when they are scheduled for their treatment to be updated. The OCO also confirmed that the patient has been evaluated for this issue and has been receiving treatment for the reported symptoms.	Information Provided
119. The incarcerated individual reports that the facility holds a Violence Prevention Field Day and the individual feels that the facility is not transparent about who they choose to attend. The individual feels that the process of choosing individuals is not equitable and excludes certain groups of people.	The OCO provided information regarding how individuals were chosen to attend the facility's Violence Prevention Field Day. The facility had a much larger number of individuals qualified to attend the event recently compared to previous years, but they had budgeted for lunches based on prior numbers. The facility randomly selected qualified individuals to attend the event and confirmed they will budget for a larger number of attendees for future events.	Information Provided
120. The incarcerated individual reports that staff wrote him up for being asleep in his bed. They did not consider that he was sent home early from his graveyard shift because he is anemic and has an HSR. The staff member told him that it was a compliance check, and he must be awake. This person also reports that this staff member has been doing this to all the late-night/graveyard porters.	The OCO provided information to this person about their behavior observation entry (BOE). There is no BOE or infraction for this concern. However, the OCO was at this facility recently and is in conversation with DOC leadership about the excessive number of minor infractions other people in this unit have experienced.	Information Provided
121. Person reports that the funds on the previous phone account have not been refunded or transferred to the new account. Person says at this point the missing funds equates to theft from the contractors. Person filed a resolution request but the response included instructions for him to contact Securus via the website which person cannot do.	The OCO provided information on how to contact Securus customer service to locate the individual's missing funds. Incarcerated individuals can call Securus' hotline for incarcerated individuals at 1-855-273-7292. If they have family or friends who can help, they can also call Securus' customer service line at 1-800-844-6591 or 972-734-1111. The OCO also reached out to JPay, who acknowledged issues in the transition to Securus, and encouraged patience as the transition occurs.	Information Provided
122. The incarcerated individual reports there is a discrepancy with his time calculations and needs assistance to get his release date fixed.	The OCO provided information about this person's time calculations. The OCO contacted DOC and requested the correspondence sent to this person about their time calculations. The	Information Provided

	OCO determined that DOC fixed the issue with OMNI and followed up with a letter explaining all the changes that were made.	
123. The incarcerated individual reports that DOC staff are not enforcing the rules when other incarcerated individuals play music in their cells too loud. The individual requested the case be reviewed again because the concerns he reported regarding noise in the unit have not been addressed.	The OCO provided information about the current issue related to noise in the unit and how to report these concerns. The OCO spoke to the CUS of the unit, and they shared the individual has been moved to another unit and that works well for the individual. The OCO discussed the noise concerns with the CUS, and he shared he tries to address the noise level as it is reported to him. The OCO shared with the individual how to report issues on the unit and have them addressed by DOC staff.	Information Provided
124. Individual reported in-person that a cell search took a long time. When he asked to use the bathroom, he was told no, which caused him to urinate on himself.	The OCO reviewed the incident, the resolution request and spoke with the facility leadership regarding this concern. The facility stated that the cell search did not take an extended, however the facility identified that they need to change the process for bathroom access during cell searches of housing units with wet cells. This office verified the individual was not infracted for the incident and was given dry clothing.	Information Provided
125. The incarcerated individual reports that he is not consistently getting responses from the resolution department. The individual reports that there are times when it has taken months to receive a response.	The OCO provided information regarding the resolution request that the individual referenced having extensions for the level II and level III responses. This office also recommended that the individual kite the Resolution Department at his facility if he has not received a response or notice of an extension within the timeframes outlined in the resolution program manual.	Information Provided
126. External person reports an incarcerated individual is experiencing retaliation from DOC staff in the unit. The external person reports the same DOC staff members have infracted him multiple times and written a negative behavior observation entry (BOE) about him. The external person reports the items the individual was infracted for were not his and were left in a common area and reports the DOC staff member that wrote the infractions responded to his BOE appeal. The individual wants to transfer to another facility and worries the infractions and negative BOE will affect his ability to transfer to a facility closer to his family.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO reviewed the infraction and BOE and was unable to locate enough evidence to substantiate retaliation. The OCO verified that the BOE appeal was received by the CPM office in compliance with DOC 300.010 Behavior Observations. The OCO verified the infractions were general infractions and should not have a negative impact on any possible transfers in the future.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
127. Incarcerated individual had another individual call on their behalf regarding	The OCO reviewed the segregation placement and find it was due to an infractable behavior and did not find any evidence of a medical	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate

	being placed in segregation while they were having a medical emergency.	emergency being related to the segregation placement.	
128.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about an infraction they received as they state DOC staff is lying.	The OCO reviewed the individual's prison discipline record and did not find any recent infractions related to the substance of this concern. The OCO advised the individual if they feel this is incorrect, they can contact this office with the infraction group number (IGN) and the concern can be investigated further.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
129.	The incarcerated individual reports concerns with the response to his resolution request regarding legal mail being opened without his presence. The individual reports that staff claimed to have reviewed the video footage, but if they had reviewed it, they would not have claimed his complaint held no merit.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. This office reviewed the video footage of the individual receiving his legal mail, and due to the quality of the footage, the OCO was unable to determine whether the individual's legal mail was opened prior to him receiving it.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
130.	Incarcerated individual does not think it is fair that he is restricted from working at correctional industries (CI) due to his crime. The individual reports he has earned minimum custody and has worked for CI at his previous facility. The individual reports this is also barring him from certain educational opportunities and marketable job skills he will need when released to find employment.	The OCO was unable to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. Per DOC 700.000 Work Programs in Prison, "The percentage of Life Without Parole (LWOP) workers assigned to CI will be limited to the extent possible and not exceed the percentage of LWOP assigned to general population at the facility." This means that DOC is only allowed to hire a certain amount of individuals serving LWOP sentences to CI employment. The OCO verified the individual has been placed on a waiting list for CI employment.	No Violation of Policy
131.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about receiving an 810 infraction for abusing the lay-in system for work. They state that they needed medical attention and that is why they did not attend work.	The OCO reviewed the infraction and appeal packet and find there is evidence to substantiate the infraction. The individual was terminated from their job due to chronic lay-ins and there are no medical kites regarding a work-related issue.	No Violation of Policy
132.	The incarcerated individual reports that mailroom staff at the facility told him that his DOC number and room number must be on all mail sent to him. The individual reports that he had previously received a magazine his mother ordered for him for two years.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by the DOC. This office found that the individual recently transferred facilities. Per DOC 450.100, Mail for Individuals in Prison, facilities will forward first-class mail, consistent with the USPS Domestic Mail Manual, for a period of 90 days if the individual provides a forwarding address. It is the individual's responsibility to inform their correspondents of a change of address.	No Violation of Policy
133.	The incarcerated individual reports concerns that his legal mail is being opened and sent through regular mail. The individual reports that legal mail is supposed to come to him first for a	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. Per DOC 450.100, Mail for Individuals in Prison, one of the requirements for Legal Mail includes that the front of the envelope must be	No Violation of Policy

signature before being opened, but that did not occur.

clearly marked "Legal Mail," "Attorney/Client," "Confidential," or similar. The OCO reviewed the investigation of this concern and found that mail to the individual from an attorney was not labeled as such.

134. The incarcerated individual reports that the response from the Resolution Specialist is incorrect. The individual reports that their concern is not a duplicate of another incarcerated individual's resolution request.	The OCO provided information regarding the Resolution Program Manual and the reason the individual's resolution request was not accepted. The individual referenced the Log ID of another individual's resolution request in their concern. Per page 18 of the Resolution Program Manual, "The individual must submit the Resolution Request on their own behalf. The individual cannot submit a Resolution Request on behalf of another individual." The OCO recommended that the individual file a new resolution request pertaining to just their own concerns.	No Violation of Policy
135. Incarcerated individual reports he was denied "hub" access preventing him from working jobs with correctional industries (CI). The individual reports he was working in the "hub" but after an audit, was dropped from the position. DOC did not explain why he was dropped and therefore he feels discriminated against. Individual requests his employment in the "hub" be granted and he get his job reinstated.	The OCO was unable to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. Per DOC 700.000 Work Programs in Prison, "The percentage of Life Without Parole (LWOP) workers assigned to CI will be limited to the extent possible and not exceed the percentage of LWOP assigned to general population at the facility." This means that DOC is only allowed to hire a certain number of individuals serving LWOP sentences to CI employment. The OCO shared the requirements for being placed on the waiting list to gain employment with CI. The individual will be eligible to be placed on the waiting list later this year.	No Violation of Policy
136. A loved one of the incarcerated individual called regarding denial of extended family visits with her husband. The loved one reports that they have exhausted the appeal process.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by the DOC. Per DOC 590.100, Extended Family Visiting, individuals with a sex offense listed in Attachment 2 will only be eligible for an Extended Family Visit (EFV) if screened through SOTAP and approved by the EFV Review Committee. The individual was screened through SOTAP and was found to be amenable to treatment, however, the EFV Review Committee denied the individual from participating in EFVs. Per DOC 590.100, "An individual may be denied based on the nature of the crime, criminal history, and current/prior behavior. If there is reason to believe that an eligible individual is a danger to self, the visitor(s), or the orderly operation of the program, the	No Violation of Policy

Superintendent/designee may exclude the individual from the program.”

<p>137. The incarcerated individual reports injury during medical transport and delayed DOC response on the related grievance. They submitted a grievance regarding this issue, and they were told that an investigation was done, and the officer reported that this person never fell. The individual appealed the outcome, and there has been an extension on the level II grievance. This was months ago, and they want to know what the status is with their appeal.</p>	<p>The OCO was able to substantiate this concern. The related grievance investigation documents were not indexed in DOC’s database, and the OCO contacted DOC Resolutions staff to request copies of the documents and asked that they be indexed. The OCO did not receive a timely response from DOC and sent multiple reminder emails and elevated to the Associated Superintendent. DOC indexed and shared the grievance investigation after several months delay. The OCO reviewed the grievance and substantiated investigation response beyond due date and extensions for the level II response. The OCO confirmed with DOC that the individual received an appeal response to their level II grievance before closing this case. Currently there is no additional appeal (level III) on file. The individual can appeal to level III for headquarters investigation and follow up with the OCO if they would like the incident in the grievance investigated by the OCO. Since the individual’s resolution was a DOC response to their appeal, the concern was substantiated, and case closed once the appeal response was confirmed.</p>	<p>Substantiated</p>
---	---	----------------------

Washington Corrections Center

<p>138. Incarcerated individual expressed concern about a urinary analysis (UA) related infraction when he had recently had surgery that impacted his ability to urinate. He was unable to get a letter from his medical provider substantiating this concern and was found guilty. Because of the infraction his extended family visits (EFVs) were taken away for three years.</p>	<p>The OCO reviewed this concern and found that the incarcerated individual did have a medical reason that impacted his ability to provide a UA within the timeline. He received an HSR for this condition after he was found guilty of the infraction. The OCO was able to provide the facility with a full review of the medical information and the facility agreed to dismiss the infraction.</p>	<p>Assistance Provided</p>
<p>139. Person has been working with medical to find out what is going on with his sleep issues, including evaluating his thyroid. They have not had follow up in some time and want to know what the plan moving forward is. He was told he is supposed to go out to a specialist appointment to evaluate the issue and does not know if that is happening since he is getting released soon. The person is requesting his appointment be verified as scheduled.</p>	<p>The OCO provided assistance. The OCO contacted Health Services management and verified the patient’s appointment to the outside specialist was scheduled.</p>	<p>Assistance Provided</p>

140. Incarcerated individual reports he has an address and is ready for release, but DOC is not following up on the needed investigation to verify that DOC approves the address. The individual requests OCO to find out why DOC has not completed the release plan investigation.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO verified that the individual's plan was not yet finalized and after our outreach DOC identified an error with the plan. The homeowner did not agree to allow the individual to release there but, DOC failed to deny the release plan until after OCO made contact. The DOC started a new release plan after the error was resolved and the individual will release soon.	Assistance Provided
141. Person reports he is no longer able to communicate with his attorneys due to the technology change in the phone system - states his attorney has a phone system that is now incompatible with DOC phone systems and does not ring when he calls.	The OCO reached out to the DOC facility staff regarding this concern. The DOC staff agreed to meet with this individual to attempt to resolve his concern.	Assistance Provided
142. Patient reports ongoing delayed access to contact lenses as recommended for treatment while awaiting a specialist appointment. Person also mentioned contacts being ordered previously but did not receive them or his appointment with the eyecare specialist.	The OCO provided assistance. This office contacted health services and confirmed the contacts were ordered for the individual. The OCO substantiated delayed access to contacts that were previously ordered but dried out before delivered to the patient and asked that DOC locate the most recently ordered pair. DOC reports the individual is now scheduled with an ophthalmology specialist for the first available appointment and the lenses are being provided as interim treatment. The OCO confirmed the contacts were delivered directly to the patient after OCO involvement and added this case to our appointment tracker.	Assistance Provided
143. Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about not receiving an infraction appeal response.	The OCO contacted DOC and was advised the individual has received their appeal response since reaching out to the OCO but before the OCO contacted DOC.	DOC Resolved
144. Incarcerated individual reports they have not been able access their legal paperwork for more than 90 days. The individual has three boxes of paperwork and was only allowed to sort through two of them, but it is the third box they need access to.	The OCO providing information to the individual about how to obtain legal property while held in a maximum custody because the individual has transferred to another facility. Per DOC 320.255 Restrictive Housing, "All property will remain in the appropriate storage container when not in use as follows: 1. One 10" x 12" x 18" box of legal documents/papers from the individual's general population property." When an individual has more than one box of legal materials, they will work with DOC staff to identify the documents they currently need, and the individual may have them while in maximum custody.	Information Provided
145. Person reports there was an unexpected death in the IMU at the facility.	The OCO provided information regarding RCW 72.09.770 and how unexpected fatality reviews (UFR) are conducted. The OCO also informed the	Information Provided

individual that UFR reports are available in the law library at the facility and if not available, can be requested.

146. Incarcerated individual reported issues with mainline and meal service at Washington Corrections Center (WCC). Individual reported that mealtimes are causing issues with programming, resulting in some individuals being late to or missing programming. Individual also expressed concern with mainline meal service and COVID risk, stating that people are in large groups in an enclosed space without masks and that there is high risk for COVID exposure.	The OCO provided information and informed the individual that WCC is actively working on fixing issues with mainline. The OCO spoke with the WCC superintendent during our Quarterly Meeting, and he addressed scheduling issues in returning to mainline and regular prison movement coming out of the pandemic, as many staff had been hired during the pandemic and had not seen normal operations. The current DOC Routine Masking Guidance (version 7) states that masks are not required in indoor congregate care settings when the community infection levels are low.	Information Provided
147. Person reports not receiving a medical assessment or follow up for possible concussion symptoms after a use of force incident.	The OCO reviewed the Patient Encounter Reports and confirmed multiple assessments were provided and the patient was also scheduled for follow up. Based on the findings of the assessments, there was no medical indication for further testing for concussion. The OCO provided the patient with information about why no further follow up was scheduled with the hospital based on the assessment findings and let them know to report any changes or symptoms to medical.	Information Provided
148. Incarcerated individual reports he was denied Graduated Reentry (GRE) Work Release due to community concerns. The individual reports that his crime did not have a victim and does not understand or agree with the denial. The individual reports that he has tried to have DOC staff assist him in understanding the denial and he has not received any information.	The OCO provided information to the individual about his GRE denial. The OCO found that the individual was denied placement at the Work Release due to the location and its proximity to where the crime the individual was convicted of was committed. The OCO also found that although the individual was denied transfer to Work Release, he was screened for Electric Home Monitoring (EHM) and the screening is currently being finalized by DOC. The OCO shared this information with the individual and shared how to get updates on his screening.	Information Provided
149. The incarcerated individual reports that he has not been able to access confidentiality envelopes to send kites or resolution requests. The individual is concerned that DOC staff could intercept the documents he is trying to send if he does not put them in a confidentiality envelope.	The OCO provided information regarding how the individual can access confidentiality envelopes. This office spoke with DOC staff in the individual's unit who confirmed that individuals may request the envelopes from staff if they are not available to take. There are times when the facility has run out of confidentiality envelopes though they do order more.	Information Provided
150. Person asked for help with a prohibitive placement at another facility. Person wants	The OCO provided information regarding requesting reconsideration of prohibitive	Information Provided

to know about the report and asks that it be removed.

placement. DOC 320.180 VI. A. 1. states that “If risk no longer exists, or the non-aggressor requests reconsideration of separation status, the separation status may be changed from active to inactive,” and that that can be documented or requested with the form DOC 17-087 Separation/Prohibition Addition/Removal. This office also informed the individual that the OCO cannot provide information about the report. DOC 320.180 I. C. states that “An individual’s separation/prohibition status is confidential. At no time will an individual be given a list of separation concerns.”

<p>151. Person reports a DOC staff told him that he has to use a pre-franked envelope or 9x12 envelope and is not sending out his requests to the OCO.</p>	<p>The OCO was able to provide information regarding the individual’s mail sent to the OCO. The office was able to verify that they had received mail from him. Also provided information from RCW 43.06c.060(1) Correspondence and communication with the office is confidential and must be protected as privileged correspondence in the same manner as legal correspondence or communication.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>152. Person was given a remanded appeal on his DOC field hearing two months ago and is not sure what next steps to follow. Person reports not knowing what the DOC hearing guidelines are.</p>	<p>The OCO provided information about DOC field hearings. The OCO was able to verify in DOC records that the appealed hearing was held and that the guilty charge was upheld. The OCO found that the individual appealed the hearing due to DOC not contacting witnesses. DOC 460.140 Hearings and Appeals policy VI. B. states, “For high-level appeals, review only the appeal, the record, and evidence presented at the hearing. The panel may not solicit or consider additional evidence.” The OCO lacks jurisdiction to investigate this complaint further because the complaint regards community custody and field discipline.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>153. Person reported being transferred from a county jail to Washington Corrections Center (WCC) and that his property from county jail was put into a locker. Person was then transferred from WCC to Washington State Penitentiary (WSP) and was told by staff that they could not find his property. Person reports kiting the property office and property sergeant.</p>	<p>The OCO provided information regarding filing a tort claim. DOC 120.500 states “All incarcerated individual tort claims alleging personal property damage/loss must be filed by the individual with the Washington State Department of Enterprise Services (DES) Risk Management Division”. The OCO also encouraged the individual to file a resolution request. The DOC Resolutions Program Manual states that individuals can file resolutions requests regarding the “Actions of Department employees, contract staff, or</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>

volunteers”, including staff actions that led to lost property.

154. Person reports being a former member of a security threat group (STG) and that a hit was put out on him while he was released, and that upon reentering prison, STG members saw him and ordered another hit on him. Person went to multiple units and did not feel safe there, and then was infracted for refusing housing and is currently losing good time.	The OCO provided information over the hotline about appealing his infraction and grieving the housing placement.	Information Provided
155. Incarcerated individual reports he continuously had priority access to the electronic law library to work on two cases until they were transferred to their current facility. The individual now rarely gets the requested Law Library access although they should be getting at least ten hours and should be able to access the law library on evenings and weekends per policy. The individual also believes DOC staff are interfering and ignoring his kites.	The OCO provided information to the individual about how to access the law library because he has transferred to another facility. The OCO shared the individual’s concerns with his new classification counselor so that they may be resolved at the lowest level possible. The OCO encouraged the individual to follow the process DOC has in place to access priority law library access.	Information Provided
156. Person reports delayed access to chemical dependency treatment.	The OCO reviewed the most recently approved custody facility plan which included a referral for transfer for chemical dependency treatment. The OCO provided the individual with this information and that they can appeal within 5 days if they do not agree. The substance use disorder recovery unit will inform the individual of next steps once they transfer facilities, and the person can send a kite after they arrive if they have specific questions.	Information Provided
157. Person states he has been in receiving for nine weeks and he is told that he needs to be cleared by medical. Person reports the people who came in after him 10-14 days ago, have already had their physicals done, have been classified and everyone he came in on the transport with have been classified and have been sent out to other facilities.	The OCO provided information regarding delays at receiving. Physicals are experiencing delays at WCC, which held people at the facility longer than normal. The OCO has evaluated the person’s concern and the staff at WCC are working to get the backlog taken care of.	Information Provided
158. Person contacted the OCO to share information as a witness regarding a previous case investigation involving abuse allegations at a DOC specific facility and issues with the resolution program.	The OCO received this information and saved it in the appropriate place for future reference.	Information Provided
159. A loved one of the incarcerated individual reports that the individual received documents from the court a few months	The OCO provided information regarding the process of e-filings. This office confirmed that there was a period of time that the e-filing inbox	Information Provided

past the date they were sent. The loved one of the individual reports that he wants to know why he was not given a legal mail log to sign and why it was not delivered more promptly.

at the individual's facility went unmonitored due to a change in staffing and confusion regarding responsibility for the inbox. The DOC has since put measures in place to prevent that from happening again. The OCO also confirmed that e-filings are not considered legal mail per the policy of the court, not the DOC, and that information is posted in law libraries at all facilities.

160. Person states that a CNA at another facility deleted his ADA accommodations from OMNI in retaliation for a grievance he wrote on her.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO contacted Health Services management and were informed his accommodations were not removed by a CNA. The Nursing Supervisor as his new facility resubmitted his Accommodation Status Reports and Health Status Reports to organize them as the patient has several placed at different times. The patient maintained the same accommodations until release.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
161. Patient states he declared a medical emergency because he was having trouble breathing. He states the nurse then ignored him and he was not seen until after the provider left. He feels like the medical staff were unprofessional and brushed him off.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO reviewed the medical records and logbook entries related to the incident and found no evidence of denied evaluation or care. The OCO confirmed the emergency response timelines were adequate.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
162. Incarcerated individual reports a DOC staff member applied pressure to his arm tightly which hurt his arm. The individual requests to be moved to another facility to be away from the DOC staff member.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO could not locate documentation to review the incident. The DOC investigated the concern through the resolution program, and the OCO verified the investigation was conducted per the Resolution Program Manual (RPM). The use of contact during a restrained movement is allowed by DOC. The OCO also verified that the individual has been moved from the facility of incident.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
163. Person states they have been experiencing a delay of care as a result of filing a grievance against staff in the medical clinic. He is requesting care for multiple issues and has only received kite responses from nursing, not his provider. He is requesting his care be done by the Veterans administration rather than DOC.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO contacted Health Services management and were informed that the patient has received consultation and care for the reported concerns. This office provided information to the patient regarding healthcare service requests through the Veterans Administration. These requests can be submitted by the patient's provider as a healthcare referral, providers typically would not be requesting services that are available locally by DOC.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate

164. External person reports their loved one was placed in solitary confinement and charged with infractions they did not commit. They were found guilty with no evidence.	The OCO reviewed the concern and the infraction. There was evidence presented at the hearing to indicate the incarcerated individual was involved in the infraction behavior. In addition, the incarcerated individual did not appeal the infraction. This individual recently had a new custody facility pan and is no longer in solitary confinement. The OCO could not find a violation of DOC 300.380 or DOC 460.000.	No Violation of Policy
165. Person reports concerns about the practice by the Washington State DOC of using the interstate compact system as a loophole to hold incarcerated people in solitary confinement for years while they are pending out of state transfer.	The OCO reviewed the incarcerated individual's records and DOC 330.600 Prisons Compact. It has been determined that this individual does not have a safe placement in WA DOC General Population. Per DOC 330.600 the department will maintain a Prisons Compact to transfer incarcerated individuals between states if the transfer is in the best interest of the state, tribe, or the welfare of the incarcerated individual. The out of state transfer process is a lengthy, this office has identified that individuals can be held in solitary confinement for years while awaiting another state to agree to house them. The DOC Classifications is unwilling to remove this individual from the list of out of state transfers. While this is no violation of policy, the OCO has suggested that the DOC consistently review this list to find placement for these individuals within WA state. The DOC did recently update the list and found placement for multiple individuals in WA.	No Violation of Policy
166. Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about DOC not completing a thorough investigation into their complaint regarding a TV being left on for two weeks straight.	The OCO reviewed all levels of the grievance and found no evidence that the grievance procedure under DOC Policy 550.100 was handled incorrectly. DOC did substantiate that the TV was faulty and has since been replaced but no other incarcerated individuals or staff reported problems with the TV. Additionally, the individual has since transferred facilities and is no longer being impacted by this concern.	No Violation of Policy
167. Person reports DOC did not handle a complaint about sexual harassment appropriately.	The OCO was unable to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO reviewed the related grievance documents and the incident reported does not meet PREA definitions outlined in DOC 490.800 Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) Prevention and Reporting and Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) Definitions (Attachment 1). This office does not have authority to impact the individual's	No Violation of Policy

requested resolutions of representation, compensation, and/or DOC staff dismissal.

<p>168. The incarcerated individual reports that he received a COVID-19 relief check from his tribe and says that it should be tax exempt. The individual reports that the DOC has never been able to tax his checks before and does not know why it was done this time.</p>	<p>The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. Per DOC 200.00, Trust Accounts for Incarcerated Individuals, Attachment 2, Deduction Matrix, "Individuals must provide their tribe with DOC 07-011 Request for Information Regarding Tribal Deposits. The tribe must submit the completed form and either reference the law or identify the source of funds to qualify as exempt from deductions." The OCO verified that DOC 07-011 was not previously submitted with the check. This office provided this information to the individual.</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy</p>
<p>169. Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about DOC staff violating policies and due process during an infraction hearing as they were denied a witness statement.</p>	<p>The OCO reviewed the infraction narrative and find there is evidence to substantiate the infraction. The individual did receive a statement that was included in the infraction packet. The OCO also reviewed the related grievance and find DOC is correct in stating the policy the individual quotes do not exist, additionally, the individual was found to have forced the victim to make a statement.</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy</p>
<p>170. Person reports they have been denied EFVs with his wife for two reasons. Person disputes the reasons and states that there should be another pathway for people in similar situations as he is in.</p>	<p>The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. Per DOC 590.100 III(A)(8) The individual must be actively participating in programming requirements (e.g., education, work, actively participating in SOTAP) or establish that a reasonable effort has been made to obtain a school or work assignment. (10) An individual with any documented history/indicator of domestic violence will be excluded from EFV privileges for the following (a.) the victim of the documented violence, and (b) person with a like relationship to the individual as a victim (e.g., individuals who assaulted a spouse /state registered domestic partner, intimate partner) will be precluded from visits with a spouse or state registered domestic partner.)</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy</p>
<p>171. Incarcerated individual reports he is having issues getting a release plan finalized and approved because he is wheelchair bound. The individual reports because of his wheelchair, it is harder to find DOC approved housing.</p>	<p>The OCO was unable to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO reviewed the individual's release planning and found that DOC followed protocols outlined in DOC 350.200 Transition and Release. The OCO verified that the individual's release plan has been finalized and he will be releasing soon.</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy</p>

172. Incarcerated individual reports he is being held past his earned release date (ERD) due to a law enforcement notifier that is not related to his current conviction. The individual requests the OCO review for possible early release.	The OCO was unable to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. According to DOC 350.600 Law Enforcement Notification "The Correctional Records Supervisor/designee will make notifications: 1. At least 35 days before: a. Release for individuals convicted of a violent, sex, domestic violence court order violation, or felony harassment offense, when the planned release date has been determined." The OCO verified the individual's conviction meets the criteria in this policy to require a 35-day notification before release.	No Violation of Policy
173. Incarcerated individual is past his earned release date (ERD) and would like help ensuring that DOC is helping him release.	The OCO was unable to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO reviewed the individual's release planning and found that DOC followed protocols outlined in DOC 350.200 Transition and Release. The OCO verified that the individual's release plan has been finalized and he will be releasing soon.	No Violation of Policy
174. Incarcerated individual has no release investigations on file and is concerned that they will be held past their earned release date (ERD). The individual requests OCO investigate the reason DOC is not working on his release planning.	The OCO was unable to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO verified DOC is working to find placement for the individual and he is not past his ERD at this time. The OCO verified DOC is following protocol outlined in DOC 350.200 Transition and Release.	No Violation of Policy
175. Incarcerated individual reports his release packet has not yet been completed. The individual is concerned that because he requires a 35-day law enforcement notification, he will be released past his earned release date (ERD) because the release plan has not been finalized.	The OCO was unable to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO reviewed the individual's release planning and found that DOC followed protocols outlined in DOC 350.200 Transition and Release. The OCO verified that the individual's release plan has been finalized and he will be releasing soon.	No Violation of Policy
176. Incarcerated individual has release plan that was pre-approved place to release to, but reports DOC staff are not finalizing the release plan. The individual reports that multiple individuals have been experiencing this issue in the unit and have not been released on time as a result.	The OCO was unable to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO verified that DOC followed protocols outlined in DOC 350.200 Transition and Release. The OCO found that the release plan was not finalized due to responses from the housing sponsor. The sponsor initially agreed to house him then due to bedspace issues had to rescind the agreement to house this individual. Since this denial, another release plan has been created an approved.	No Violation of Policy
177. The incarcerated individual reports that his daughter's mother was denied visitation. He reports he has appealed and has been denied.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by the DOC. Per DOC 450.300, Visits for Incarcerated Individuals, Attachment 1, Eligibility Requirements for Visitors, convicted felons will not be granted permission to visit for two years	No Violation of Policy

after expiration of sentence. Immediate family members may be considered after one year with documents showing the immediate family relationship.

178. The incarcerated individual reports that emails through JPay are not going through because the system is backlogged. The individual reports that this was distressing over the holidays as his Christmas greetings did not go through.	The OCO was able to substantiate this concern. This office is aware that JPay is often backlogged, however, the OCO does not have jurisdiction over JPay.	Substantiated
179. Incarcerated individual reports they have been denied access to the law library after being transferred to the intensive management unit (IMU). The individual requested law library access multiple times and when they were transferred to a different unit, they again did not receive a response from DOC about access to the law library with one exception. The individual reports they have been denied access to the law library for over a month and requests the OCO assist them in gaining immediate access to the law library.	The OCO was able to substantiate this concern. The OCO found that after filing a resolution request at the facility of incident the individual was transferred and the facility of incident has not yet responded to the resolution request. The OCO was unable to verify that the individual was able to access the law library while at Washington Corrections Center.	Substantiated

Washington Corrections Center for Women

180. Individual was released from IMU into receiving and has been there for weeks awaiting return to general population.	The OCO contacted the facility to ask the status of her custody facility plan. Her plan has been approved and she was moved back to general population.	Assistance Provided
181. The incarcerated individual reports concerns about the resolution program at her facility. The individual reports that when the facility is impeding her ability to file a civil rights case against the DOC by not accepting several of her resolution requests.	The OCO provided information regarding the Resolution Program Manual and DOC 550.100, Resolution Program. This office reviewed the resolution requests the individual cited and found that they were not accepted within the Resolution Program Manual Guidelines. The OCO found that the resolution requests were not accepted due to being beyond the timeframe of the incident, reporting multiple issues in one resolution request, and/or having five active resolution requests at the time the individual filed a new one.	Information Provided
182. Person reports her pod has not been getting gym times regularly and she was told by staff that it is because gym is scheduled at the same time as shift change. Person says that that issue should not be imposed upon incarcerated individuals and their pod is the only unit that does not get gym time regularly.	The OCO reviewed the related level 0 grievance after receiving multiple complaints about this issue. DOC reports the Lieutenant worked with the resolution department to ensure the unit that has gym during shift change will still be able to move to the gym. There were no appeals on file for this DOC Resolution Request and this office provided the individual with self-advocacy	Information Provided

information. If the issue is still occurring after DOC informal resolution via grievance, the individual can file a grievance appeal or a new grievance about the concern and follow up with the OCO if unresolved by DOC.

<p>183. Person is having gastrointestinal issues for almost a year. She was told it was a weakening of the stomach muscles, but the person does not feel that is right. She had to spend time in the hospital due to this issue. She is requesting an ultrasound to figure out what is happening and to be treated by her previous provider.</p>	<p>The OCO provided information to the patient regarding the imaging request approval process. The OCO confirmed the patient's current care with Health Services management. The patient's care was referred to the Facility Medical Director for elevated care. The requested consult will be considered after the patient goes through the requisite conservative treatment measures. The clinical appropriateness of any imaging requests must be determined by the ordering provider. These requests must fall within the coverage of the health plan or be presented to the Care Review Committee to be approved.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>184. Person reports her pod has not been getting gym times regularly and she was told by staff that it is because gym is scheduled at the same time as shift change. Person says that that issue should not be imposed upon incarcerated individuals and their pod is the only unit that does not get gym time regularly. This impacts people who buy weight cards and are not able to use them.</p>	<p>The OCO reviewed the related level 0 grievance after receiving multiple complaints about this issue. DOC reports the Lieutenant worked with the Resolution Department to ensure the unit that has gym during shift change will still be able to move to the gym. There were no appeals on file for this DOC Resolution Request and this office provided the individual with self-advocacy information. If the issue is still occurring after DOC informal resolution via grievance, the individual can file a grievance appeal or a new grievance about the concern and follow up with the OCO if unresolved by DOC.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>185. A loved one reports that an incarcerated individual was moved to a different pod as a disciplinary action. The pod she was moved to is where a particular individual is housed. The loved one reports that the individual needs to be kept separate from her codefendant for safety and security reasons.</p>	<p>The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO investigated and found that the incarcerated individual has a documented separation with this particular individual and that they are both currently housed in different units.</p>	<p>Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate</p>
<p>186. Incarcerated individual reports she was harmed by DOC staff while in the closed observation area (COA) and Residential Treatment Units (RTUs). The individual reports she was gassed and given medications and water that were harmful. The individual believes this all occurred in retaliation from a triangulating conflict with another incarcerated person and a staff member and had escalated and</p>	<p>The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO reviewed all relevant documentation and was unable to substantiate any harm caused by DOC staff. The individual was moved to the COA for medical reasons that have been resolved since.</p>	<p>Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate</p>

intensified her fear of other incarcerated individuals and staff in the facility.

187. Person states that she is seven months pregnant and DOC is saying she is not pregnant and is not allowing her an ultrasound.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO contacted Health Services management and were informed the patient had recently been evaluated and had blood tests completed. There is no indication for an ultrasound as the patient is not pregnant.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
188. External person reports his fiancé was the victim of a sexual assault by a guard. Says his fiancé is now being retaliated against by DOC staff due to the issue and she is getting major infractions as retaliation.	The OCO reviewed the PREA allegation and infraction records. The PREA investigation has been referred to law enforcement and the staff member is no longer employed by the Department of Corrections. This individual has not received any recent infractions and has none pending. The OCO could not find evidence to substantiate retaliation by the DOC. This office did share information regarding how to request a transfer if this individual wants to move to another facility.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
189. External person called hotline stating that loved one has been placed in Ad Seg while under investigation for a fight that the incarcerated did not take part in.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. Per DOC 320.200 II An individual may be assigned to Ad Seg when the individual: E. Is pending investigation for behavior that represents a significant threat. The OCO was able to verify that the individual was release back to general population after the investigation.	No Violation of Policy
190. The individual reports staff recently placed her back in segregation. She reports that she has bruises and scratches. She feels like staff target her, and don't give her a chance to communicate or respond appropriately. Instead, they overreact, and put her in segregation.	The OCO reviewed her records and confirmed she was no longer housed in segregation. This office reviewed the incident in question and verified she was involved in an altercation with another incarcerated individual and was placed in segregation. The OCO could not find a violation of DOC 320.200.	No Violation of Policy
191. Person reports she was told she would be tapered off the medication due to ERD being far out.	After review of the person's complaint and DOC Protocol for Management of Medications for Opioid Use Disorder at intake, it is determined that there is no violation of policy. The protocol states that if the person's ERD is greater than six months that the person will be tapered off the medication. This will occur in four milligram increments until the medication is discontinued.	No Violation of Policy
192. Patient reports having medical and dental issues that DOC is not treating. Person fell descending the top bunk due to numbness and loss of grip but medical states she does not qualify for a health status report (HSR) for a lower bunk to avoid further injuries.	The OCO was able to substantiate this concern. The OCO elevated these concerns to the facility health services and Health Service Administrators (HSAs). After multiple attempts at mediation and verification of an HSR wrist brace, DOC did not agree to provide the HSR for a lower bunk stating the individual does not	Substantiated

meet the HSR criteria. DOC reports the individual received an x-ray and could not identify any dental kites requesting care. This office provided the individual with self-advocacy information related to medical and dental follow up.

Washington State Penitentiary

193. External person reported loved one is in solitary confinement and does not feel safe at this facility.	The OCO reviewed the incarcerated individual's records and infraction history then contacted DOC Classifications. He was referred to max committee for review. His custody facility plan has been updated and will be moving to a different facility.	Assistance Provided
194. Person reports he has a doctor's note and HSR for medical shoes to be provided by DOC. They have not had issues ordering his shoes in the past, but the staff member who usually orders his shoes has moved on and he has not been able to receive the shoes.	The OCO provided assistance to the patient by contacted health services management to request that they review the patients' medical shoe order. DOC found the patient was eligible for replacement and ordered the replacement shoes.	Assistance Provided
195. Individual reports he was infractioned for using an item as a self-harm tool and for threatening. He claims he did not threaten anyone. He was experiencing a mental health crisis.	The OCO reviewed the infractions and hearing. The individual was given an infraction for threatening and for possessing a weapon. Staff wrote in the report that he did verbally threaten them during the incident. and the DOC has declined to dismiss the infraction for threatening. However, after a review of the infraction for possession of a weapon, the DOC did dismiss the infraction, as he was not utilizing the razor as a weapon, he was using it as a self-harm tool.	Assistance Provided
196. Person is requesting an in-person interview with the Office of the Corrections Ombuds to disclose and discuss several concerns.	The OCO will be onsite at WSP in February.	Assistance Provided
197. Person reported that only one phone in the pod works, which makes it hard to contact family and loved ones, because there is only one phone for 20+ individuals.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO verified in DOC records that the individual contacted the facility superintendent, and that the superintendent has been in contact with Securus to get a technician to come to Washington State Penitentiary to solve the issue.	DOC Resolved
198. The incarcerated individual reports that he was moved to part of the IMU with phones upstairs, and the individual reports he is not able to go up the stairs to access the phones. The individual reports that he tried to ask DOC staff about moving to another lower level with access to phones and was told no.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The individual was moved to another area with phones on the same level shortly after reporting this concern to the OCO.	DOC Resolved

<p>199. Incarcerated individual reports concerns with his transportation to his county of release. DOC has explained to him that a DOC staff member will have to give him a ride to his community corrections officer (CCO). This individual would like to leave by other means of transportation, because he does not have to see his CCO for 24 hours and would like to go home first.</p>	<p>DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. DOC spoke with the individual's contacts in the community, and they arranged private transportation for the individual.</p>	<p>DOC Resolved</p>
<p>200. Person says they followed all instructions given by the OCO on a previous case and the person never received an appointment or a response from DOC for a medical records review appointment.</p>	<p>DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO reviewed previous OCO case for this concern as well as related grievance investigations. This office contacted DOC and confirmed the patient recently attended a medical records review appointment.</p>	<p>DOC Resolved</p>
<p>201. A loved one reports that an incarcerated individual was in his cell cleaning while a correctional officer (CO) got attacked outside his cell. The incarcerated individual and everyone else from the unit was then placed in the Intensive management unit (IMU). The incarcerated individual was then told he would be infraacted for the attack on the guard. The loved one states that the individual was in his cell at the time and had nothing to do with the incident.</p>	<p>DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO verified that this individual was moved back to general population and does not have any infractions on record relating to this incident.</p>	<p>DOC Resolved</p>
<p>202. A loved one of the incarcerated individual reports that her daughter has been denied visits with the individual. The loved one reports that they are planning to get married soon and feels that visits with his stepdaughter would be beneficial in building their family.</p>	<p>The OCO provided information regarding self-advocacy steps the individual and his family may take to have visitation privileges potentially reconsidered pertaining to their specific situation.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>203. The incarcerated individual reports that he is being held at Washington State Penitentiary (WSP) as a boarder from the Columbia County Jail. The individual reports he has not been issued an IPIN for the phone and he is not able to call anyone besides OCO. The individual has filed a resolution request which instructed him to write the correctional unit supervisor (CUS) and unit sergeant and he did not receive a response. The individual has an active court case and needs to be in touch with his attorney.</p>	<p>The OCO provided the individual with information about how to access a phone call. The OCO verified Securus is unwilling to provide the individual with an IPIN, because he is not under the jurisdiction of the DOC. DOC staff have been willing to provide the individual with calls to family and his attorney at no cost to him, to remedy the issue. The OCO shared this information with the individual and explained how to set up a call while housed at WSP.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>

204. Person states DOC is not giving him his court documents while he is in IMU. They are in his property, and he does not have access.	The OCO was able to provide information regarding the process for individuals in restrictive housing to request access to legal paperwork.	Information Provided
205. Person states that he erroneously did not receive earned time while in maximum custody and in compliance with his custody facility plan.	The OCO contacted DOC about this concern and see the individual is trying to take current policy language and apply it to time that was before that language was in effect as policy 350.100 is not retroactive. Before the new language was implemented, an RCW was changed. In that change, the DOC administration agreed to allow the change to be retroactive only to earned time while on MAX custody that occurred between March 2020 and May 2022. Policy language in 350.100 states that individuals are ineligible for earned time if they serve more than 20 days or more in one calendar month in administrative segregation, disciplinary segregation or IMU for negative behavior. If an individual was in segregation for other reasons, such as protective custody, they could earn the earned time, provided they maintained positive behavior throughout the placement. This would not apply if they were placed in segregation pending an infraction even if they were eventually found not guilty or not demoted in custody level as this is still considered negative behavior. The particular policy language (350.100) was not in effect until April 2022 and does not apply to the time this individual was in administrative segregation.	Information Provided
206. The incarcerated individual reports that his JPAY player was taken during a cell search. He reports that he has tried to file resolution requests and send kites, but the player has not been returned to him.	The OCO provided information regarding the placement of his JPAY player. The player was taken during a cell search and incorrectly placed in the Evidence Room. Once this was brought to the attention of DOC staff, the player was transferred to the property room and placed with the individual's property in long term storage due to his current custody level. The individual will be receiving a new tablet once the facility distributes them.	Information Provided
207. The incarcerated individual reports that money on his phone account did not transfer when the facility switched to Securus. The individual reports that he has a large amount of money on his account to call his attorney to work on active court cases. The individual reports that this is affecting many individuals and the DOC is not providing a solid	The OCO provided information on how to contact Securus customer service to locate the individual's missing funds. Incarcerated individuals can call Securus' hotline for incarcerated individuals at 1-855-273-7292. If they have family or friends who can help, they can also call Securus' customer service line at 1-800-844-6591 or 972-734-1111. The OCO also reached out to JPAY, who acknowledged issues in	Information Provided

	answer on when the funds will be transferred to the new account.	the transition to Securus, and encouraged patience as the transition takes place.	
208.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about placement in IMU, not being given their legal mail, and retaliation from staff that are giving them cold food and not allowing them to shower.	The OCO reviewed the individual's grievances and do not find any recent ones regarding legal mail, food or showers. There is also no evidence of misconduct or retaliation by staff. The OCO also reviewed the in-works custody facility plan and spoke to DOC about it, it is in process, and the individual should get a notification soon. The OCO advised the individual if they would like to appeal it, they can do so within five days and give the appeal to their counselor.	Information Provided
209.	Person reported missing property, including medications, ID, and his watch.	The OCO provided information over the hotline about filing a resolution request, kiting medical to have medications replaced, and kiting property for missing items.	Information Provided
210.	Person reports issues with the restoration of his earned time from the IMU, rules were changed recently.	The OCO provided information regarding eligibility requirements for Reentry Center placement. Per DOC 300.500 II Eligibility A. An individual is prohibited from Reentry Center placement and should not be considered if the individual: (1) Will not be assigned to Minimum 1 custody within 12 months of the Earned Release Date (ERD) or has had a custody demotion after approval. (a) Individuals eligible for Graduated Reentry must be eligible for Minimum 1 custody within 18 months of ERD.	Information Provided
211.	The incarcerated individual reports that when he transferred facilities, his TV was broken, and he was missing some property. The individual reports that he has problems accessing the necessary forms because English is his second language.	The OCO provided information regarding how the individual can file a Tort Claim if his property has been lost. This office also provided information on how the individual can access translation services to complete the tort claim, as the forms are not currently available in any language other than English.	Information Provided
212.	Incarcerated individual reports they have been having medical issues for the past year and a half. They report they are unable to work due to these medical concerns. They state they were unassigned from work and then got a write-up due to missing work and were found guilty. The person reported that the DOC did not reverse his sanctions after the infraction was overturned.	The OCO reviewed the infraction concern and contacted the medical provider who corroborated the individual's story about missing work due to medical conditions. The OCO then reached out to the facility who was unwilling to overturn the infraction. The OCO then contacted DOC headquarters about the infraction as hearings staff did not contact medical about the concerns during the investigation of the infraction and the medical concerns being substantiated by the provider. The infraction was then overturned, and the sanctions were reversed. The OCO followed up with DOC who confirmed that his security clearance was never	Information Provided

changed, and his custody points have been restored.

213.	Person is seeking reimbursement for personal property that was broken during a cell search. Person alleges staff were negligent during a cell search resulting in his television being broken. Person has already filed a tort claim with DES and wanted to know if the process can be expedited.	The OCO provided information regarding the tort claim process and shared that there is no set timeframe for tort claims. The OCO encouraged the individual to stay in contact with DES.	Information Provided
214.	External person reports that individual was accused of touching a female officer. Person reports that the individual did not do it and was still found guilty of an infraction and now he will not go out on GRE.	The OCO contacted facility leadership regarding this concern. The OCO substantiated video evidence to confirm the guilty finding of the infraction. This individual will be demoted and transferred to a different location for the remainder of their sentence. In addition, the individual did not appeal the infraction.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
215.	Incarcerated individual reports a DOC staff member favors incarcerated individuals who are white over incarcerated individuals who are Black and gives them priority for employment. The incarcerated individual reports the DOC staff member also allow these individuals out of their cells first and allows them to use the phones and JPAY first. The individual requests to be moved away from this DOC staff member.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO spoke to DOC management staff at the facility and found the process for hiring is done by a waitlist that is not modified by unit staff. DOC staff also explained incarcerated individuals are let out of their cells by scheduled time. The OCO also verified that the individual has been moved from the unit to another facility, fulfilling his request to be moved away from the DOC staff member.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
216.	Person reports DOC staff are removing his name from sick call and not responding to his grievances. Person requested staff be fired and to receive sick call appointment.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO reviewed appointments and found the patient was seen for sick call at the end of January. In order for the OCO to review staff conduct concerns, the individual will need to grieve the issue to level II.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
217.	The incarcerated individual reports their incoming mail is not logged or signed for. The person states documents that are not signed for are destroyed or misplaced, including PREA responses, E-Filings, and grievances.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. This office reviewed this person's electronic file and determined that their resolution requests are receiving log ID's and DOC staff are directing them to follow the correct process for PREA investigations. The OCO could not find evidence that DOC is withholding or destroying their incoming mail.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
218.	Incarcerated individual reports issues with his classification counselor assisting him with release planning. The individual reports the counselor will not help him apply for a housing voucher, declines to use addresses he provides and speaks to	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO reviewed the individual's central file and found that the DOC allowed the individual to use the DOC housing voucher even with a pending infraction. The individual's first release plan was denied by	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate

him unprofessionally. The individual reports that multiple other incarcerated individuals are experiencing this from the counselor. The individual also reports that because of a pending infraction his counselor is saying that he will not release, and the hearing was just continued. Requests the OCO help him release to a sober living home.

the housing sponsor. The individual's second release plan was approved, and he was released and not held for the pending infraction. Based on the evidence reviewed, the OCO cannot substantiate DOC staff delayed the individual's release. The housing sponsor can decide to not house the individual and this choice will deny the release plan.

219.	Person states they are being discriminated against in a matter related to a visitation denial.	After review of the complaint and documentation regarding visitation, this office found that DOC is within policy. Per DOC 450.300 VII Denial, Suspension or Termination of Visits (A)(2) An individual's sanction and visitor's suspension may vary in duration and the type of visitation privilege(s) loss will be relatable to the violation behavior (e.g., introduction of contraband during the in person visit, sexually suggestive during a video visit.) (B) Person identified as being involved in attempting/considering to introduce or aiding and abetting another to introduce contraband in anyway, will have their visit privileges suspended or terminated.	No Violation of Policy
220.	External person reports their loved one was infractioned and placed in segregation due to a staff assault they were not involved in. They have not been allowed out of their cell or allowed to use the phone.	The OCO verified that the infractions were no longer on his record, and he was moved back to general population. The OCO confirmed that while he was in segregation, he was allowed out of his cell and had access to phones. The DOC was following policy 320.200 while the incident was investigated.	No Violation of Policy
221.	Person reports that he was infractioned for participating in a multi-person fight that he said he was coerced into. Person was demoted to close custody and then asked for protective custody due to safety concerns. Person found out he would be transferred to general population at a different facility and is concerned for his safety at the new facility.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO verified that DOC investigated this individual's security concerns and were unable to validate them. The OCO also verified a series of infractions that led to the individual's placement in close custody. DOC 300.380 VI. D. states, "Individuals will only be transferred to a same custody level facility for: 1. Safety, security, and protection reasons". DOC is within policy to transfer the individual from one close custody facility to another.	No Violation of Policy
222.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about their placement as DOC did not follow through with their request for a lower custody level or take into account their mental health concerns.	The OCO reviewed the custody facility plan and found the individual was transferred to the facility that they themselves had requested.	No Violation of Policy

223.	Person reports 13 pieces of outgoing legal mail has been rejected as not being legal mail. Person states the law librarian deemed it legal mail. Person paid for the postage and is now out the cost of the mail.	Per DOC 450.100 X(B) Rejected outgoing mail/eMessages are automatically reviewed by the Superintendent/designees and Headquarters Correctional Manager if the rejection is upheld by the Superintendent/designee and does not require an appeal request.	No Violation of Policy
224.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about their safety and was denied an interview with DOC headquarters to discuss protective custody, they are afraid they will be placed in mainline.	The OCO reviewed the individual's concern and did not find any evidence that substantiates the individual's concern, rather, the individual was placed in a facility they agreed to transfer to after being involved in the facility planning process.	No Violation of Policy
225.	The incarcerated individual reports that the TV in the dayroom has not been working properly for several months.	The OCO substantiates the concerns related to the cable TV at WSP and has spoken to DOC staff at the facility who are aware of the issue and working to resolve it. The cable issues stem from the physical plant of the WSP facility and its age. These factors create barriers in providing quality cable access. The contractors working with DOC are looking at multiple ways to try to resolve the issue.	Substantiated
226.	The incarcerated individual reports that cable at the facility does not work correctly. The individual reports that they pay for cable, but it still does not work properly.	The OCO substantiates the concerns related to the cable TV at WSP and has spoken to DOC staff at the facility who are aware of the issue and working to resolve it. The cable issues stem from the physical plant of the WSP facility and its age. These factors create barriers in providing quality cable access. The contractors working with DOC are looking at multiple ways to try to resolve the issue. The OCO requested that the DOC consider providing refunds to individuals for cable, but the DOC reported that they are unwilling to do so.	Substantiated

INTAKE INVESTIGATIONS

Airway Heights Corrections Center

227.	Person reports that facility nurses and corrections officers were disrespectful and demeaning while distributing medication, including discussing the convictions of other incarcerated individuals. Person reports that the nurse targeted him for moving during the distribution of the medication, when he has a chronic pain condition and has to shift his weight to be comfortable.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
------	---	--	-------------------------------------

228.	Person reports that they vented to a counselor and an incident report was filed. Person states they were infracted for someone else's 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. Individual was advised to contact the OCO after infraction hearing and once they have received a response after an appeal.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
229.	Person reported that he is being infracted for books that supposedly contain sexually explicit material. Person reported that these books were vetted, approved, and given to him through the mailroom months ago.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
230.	The incarcerated individual reports that he was given an infraction for interfering with count. Person reports that the cellmate was on the edge of his bed and that him and his cellmate were counted by the officers. After count he was approached by an officer who asked where he was during count and was then infracted.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
231.	Person reports that he has to eat pureed food due to a bad ulcer, and that he is getting the same meal, mashed potatoes and gravy, twice a day every day. Person wants the same meals as everyone else, but pureed.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
232.	Person reports his four-person cell was searched and that contraband was found. The correctional officer (CO) told the other cellmates that he would have to infract everyone, but that they would be found not guilty because the cellmate admitted guilt. In the infraction narrative, the CO left out the cellmate admitting guilt, and the person was still infracted.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
233.	External complainant says that their loved told them on the phone a staff assault on a different incarcerated individual happened in their unit recently.	The OCO reviewed this concern and did not have enough information to move forward with an investigation. Per WAC 138-10-040-The ombuds may decline to investigate any complaint or may close any investigation of	Declined

		any complaint for any of the following reasons: The nature and quality of evidence.	
234.	Person anonymously reported an incident with staff and wants the staff to take anger management.	This complaint is anonymous and there is not information to pursue an investigation and the OCO does not have the authority to dictate staff discipline. Per WAC 138-10-040- The ombuds may decline to investigate any complaint or may close any investigation of any complaint for any of the following reasons: The requested resolution is not within the ombuds statutory power and authority and the nature and quality of evidence.	Declined
235.	External person reports medical concerns about a currently incarcerated individual.	The OCO has declined to review this concern. The OCO is required to establish priorities based on the limited resources available to the office. The external person forged the incarcerated individual's signature on a confidentiality waiver and the OCO declined to accept this complaint. The incarcerated individual has access to the OCO hotline and filing a complaint via mail and has not contacted this office about new medical concerns.	Declined
236.	The incarcerated individual reports that he filed a tort claim with Department of Enterprise Services (DES) regarding missing items when he transferred from WSP to AHCC, and that DES refunded him a small fraction of what his items were worth. The individual asked for DES to provide information regarding who they talked to in their investigation and spoke with DOC staff and was told that they never got a call about his tort claim investigation. DES sent him their investigation paperwork, and everything was redacted.	The OCO lacks jurisdiction to investigate this complaint because the complaint relates to an action taken by an agency other than the Washington State Department of Corrections.	Lacked Jurisdiction

Cedar Creek Corrections Center

237.	A loved one called in to report staff misconduct. Loved one states that incarcerated individual was retaliated against after they made a report and was given negative BOE and major infraction.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
------	--	--	-------------------------------------

Clallam Bay Corrections Center

238.	Person states the prison took money from his account that was on a hold. It could only be used for the shipping of	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
------	--	---	-------------------------------------

his TVs and instead it was sent to another facility. He states that facility never sent him anything while he was at there for surgery.

complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.

Coyote Ridge Corrections Center

239. The incarcerated individual reports that he is having problems with officers at the facility and says they are stopping him from getting a job.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
240. Person expressed security concerns with the law library being available on the new tablets. Person says this places people at risk by exposing their criminal history and legal cases to other incarcerated individuals who would bully and harass them.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
241. Person reports that he is being investigated but has not been told what for. Person also reports that DOC took his phone book and some religious items, and that without his phone book, he cannot contact family and friends.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
242. Person states he has sent multiple kites to medical, and his needs are not being met.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
243. The incarcerated individual is from another country and has family in Seattle and Sweden. He reports that he does not have translation services for his native language, and while he speaks passable English, he cannot adequately write in English. This person also reports that he has been moved to a facility closer to his family and wants to remain there.	Per WAC 138-10-040- The ombuds may decline to investigate any complaint or may close any investigation of any complaint for any of the following reasons: Department took action to resolve any alleged violations.	Declined
244. Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about an infraction they feel there is no evidence for, beyond the word of the DOC staff person.	This concern regards a general infraction which the OCO does not investigate per RCW 43.06.040(2)(a)(v) general infractions do not adversely affect the health, safety, welfare, and rights of incarcerated individuals.	Declined
245. Person reports they believe DOC has him mistaken for another individual with the	Per RCW 43.06C.040 (e) The ombuds may not investigate any complaints relating to an	Declined

same name. Person states that his sentence and ERD are incorrect because of this issue.

incarcerated person's underlying criminal conviction. The individual was given information on how to contact the DOC contract attorney.

246. An external person reports that their incarcerated nephew is experiencing problems receiving mail. Their nephew has made several attempts to pursue internal remedies. However, DOC staff ignore or dismiss such attempts, and he has been the target of harassment instead.	The incarcerated individual did not respond to the OCO's request to provide additional information within 30 days. The OCO encouraged this person to contact this office if they would like to request assistance.	Person Declined OCO Involvement
---	--	---------------------------------

Larch Corrections Center

247. A loved one reports incarcerated loved one received conflicting information from counselor and officer; ended up receiving an infraction.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
--	--	-------------------------------------

Monroe Correctional Complex

248. Incarcerated individual reports getting two serious infractions for inappropriate behavior during a video visit and feels that these infractions were not fair.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
--	--	-------------------------------------

249. A loved one reports that incarcerated sent them a message, that was consensual between the two of them. The message was flagged by an individual in the mailroom, stating it was a form of sexual harassment towards them. If there is anything that can be done to appeal this infraction it would be appreciated.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
--	--	-------------------------------------

250. Person had a case expunged due to the Blake decision and was not reimbursed the amount of money that DOC took from his account.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
--	--	-------------------------------------

251. Person grieved old providers for not providing him care and requested disability services for writing and reading when he needed to respond to the grievances. He alleges that DOC is telling him not to make any more disability requests because they will keep closing it out. He met with ADA	The OCO declined to investigate this concern as permitted by RCW 43.06C.040(2)(c) which states that the office "may decline to investigate any complaint as provided by the rules adopted under this chapter" as well as WAC 138-10-040(3)(g) which permits the office to decline to investigate for "[a]ny other	Declined
--	---	----------

based on what resolutions told him to do, but ADA said that resolution must provide these services so it is not being resolved.

reasons the ombuds deems relevant to the complaint including, but not limited to, the priority and weight given to these and other relevant factors.”

252. The person reports that they filed an Accommodation Review Committee Decision Appeal to Health Services at HQ regarding a disability request. The allegation is that the ADA Compliance Manager repeatedly stated they did not receive the appeal, and it is now past timeframes, so he may not submit a new appeal. Upon public disclosure of DOC records, person discovered that Health Services did in fact receive the appeal and it was forwarded to the ADA Compliance Manager.	The OCO declined to investigate this concern as permitted by RCW 43.06C.040(2)(c) which states that the office “may decline to investigate any complaint as provided by the rules adopted under this chapter” as well as WAC 138-10-040(3)(g) which permits the office to decline to investigate for “[a]ny other reasons the ombuds deems relevant to the complaint including, but not limited to, the priority and weight given to these and other relevant factors.”	Declined
253. Person made two public disclosure requests to the DOC requesting copies of his electronic health records and he wants to know the status, as he has not received a response.	The OCO declined to investigate this concern as permitted by RCW 43.06C.040(2)(c) which states that the office “may decline to investigate any complaint as provided by the rules adopted under this chapter” as well as WAC 138-10-040(3)(g) which permits the office to decline to investigate for “[a]ny other reasons the ombuds deems relevant to the complaint including, but not limited to, the priority and weight given to these and other relevant factors.”	Declined
254. The person states that he arranged to have an outside evaluation with a psychologist. He alleges that DOC staff are not assisting with coordinating the evaluation. He would like the OCO to verify coordination.	The OCO declined to investigate this concern as permitted by RCW 43.06C.040(2)(c) which states that the office “may decline to investigate any complaint as provided by the rules adopted under this chapter” as well as WAC 138-10-040(3)(g) which permits the office to decline to investigate for “[a]ny other reasons the ombuds deems relevant to the complaint including, but not limited to, the priority and weight given to these and other relevant factors.”	Declined
255. Person requests that the OCO stop a named staff member from destroying evidence, records, and documents needed for treatment, lawsuit, and participation in the grievance process.	The OCO declined to investigate this concern as permitted by RCW 43.06C.040(2)(c) which states that the office “may decline to investigate any complaint as provided by the rules adopted under this chapter” as well as WAC 138-10-040(3)(g) which permits the office to decline to investigate for “[a]ny other reasons the ombuds deems relevant to the complaint including, but not limited to, the	Declined

		priority and weight given to these and other relevant factors.”	
256.	The person is requesting assistance to have the DOC provide him the log ID numbers for grievances he had previously filed. The person claims he is being retaliated against for grieving the Resolution Specialist by not being provided the log ID numbers so he can exhaust internal remedies. Person is pursuing a Federal claim and this issue equates to denying him access to the federal courts.	The OCO declined to investigate this concern as permitted by RCW 43.06C.040(2)(c) which states that the office “may decline to investigate any complaint as provided by the rules adopted under this chapter” as well as WAC 138-10-040(3)(g) which permits the office to decline to investigate for “[a]ny other reasons the ombuds deems relevant to the complaint including, but not limited to, the priority and weight given to these and other relevant factors.”	Declined

Olympic Corrections Center

257.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about an infraction they received for pornography, drug introduction and an improvised needle. They state they filed an appeal and never heard back.	The OCO reviewed the infraction and found evidence to substantiate the infractions accompanied by the individual’s statements. The OCO reached out to DOC regarding the appeal the individual expressed concern about, DOC reviewed the infraction packet and found no appeal was ever submitted. Additionally, the individual pled guilty to the violations, as a result, the OCO will not further investigate this concern per RCW 43.06.040(2)(c) due to the nature and quality of the evidence.	Declined
------	---	---	----------

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

258.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about termination from graduated reentry (GRE) and drug offender sentencing alternative program (DOSA) as the result of an infraction.	The OCO reviewed the infraction narrative and found there was evidence to substantiate all three of the infractions as the individual tested positive for drugs and admitted to drug usage on two occasions, as a result, they were terminated from the DOSA program for violation of the conditions. Because the individual signed a document admitting to drug usage, the OCO will not further investigate this concern per RCW 43.06C(2)(b) the OCO may decline any case due to the quality and nature of evidence.	Declined
------	---	--	----------

Stafford Creek Corrections Center

259.	Person says they were transferred from Washington State Penitentiary to Stafford Creek Corrections Center and that the money that was in his account was no longer there after arriving at Stafford Creek Corrections Center. Person reports kiting the banking office asking where his funds are and has not received a response.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
------	--	--	-------------------------------------

260. Person states that officers are not using the intercom to announce meals (mainline).	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
261. The incarcerated individual reports that they need to see medical and submit kites, but medical is not responding or scheduling an appointment for them.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
262. Person states that staff at Stafford Creek Corrections Center has been tampering with people's mail.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
263. Person reports that he has been given a diagnosis with no clinical proof. Person would like proper test so he can receive an official diagnosis.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process. Person was advised to file a resolution request and to contact the OCO when a level 1 response has been received.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
264. Person reports feeling that he is being harassed by his correctional industries (CI) supervisor, especially after he talked to his supervisor's boss. Person reports being given instructions from his supervisor that conflict with other instructions he has been given. Person wants to be moved to a job in a different area.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
265. Person reports she was made to sign a contract to participate in AMEND, and that there was a behavior contract that said she would stop filing false Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) reports.	The OCO has declined to investigate this concern. Per WAC 138-10-040(d), "The ombuds may decline to investigate any complaint or may close any investigation of any complaint for any of the following reasons: The complaint does not allege violation of policy, procedure, or law." The AMEND program is an elective program that this individual can choose to not participate in if they do not want to agree to the terms.	Declined

266. Person requests help to be released to another country to volunteer as a counselor.	The OCO has declined to investigate this concern. Per WAC 138-10-040 (e), the ombuds may decline to investigate any complaint or may close any investigation of any complaint for any of the following reasons: The requested resolution is not within the ombuds' statutory power and authority.	Declined
--	---	----------

Washington Corrections Center

267. Person alleges their due process rights were violated during a disciplinary hearing by DOC staff's actions.	Per RCW 4.06C(2)(b) this individual needs to appeal their infraction before the OCO can investigate the concern further.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
--	--	-------------------------------------

268. Person reports that they were infractioned and terminated from their job for not wearing a mask. States that he is exempt from masking based on Department of Health guidelines.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process. Individual will need to appeal their grievance to level I or II and file appeal for the infraction.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
---	--	-------------------------------------

269. An incarcerated individual who is a leader in the Asatru religion reports that the religious coordinator at the facility is not sharing Asatru religious literature in the same way he shares literature for other religions. Individual reports that multiple other incarcerated individuals are requesting Asatru religious literature and being told to write the organization or pay for copies themselves. Individual reports that the previous religious coordinator would make the copies himself and provide them to incarcerated people free of charge.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
---	--	-------------------------------------

270. The incarcerated individual reports a DOC staff member put his life in danger by telling other incarcerated individuals he told on them.	Per WAC 138-10-040- The ombuds may decline to investigate any complaint or may close any investigation of any complaint for any of the following reasons: The requested resolution is not within the ombuds' statutory power and authority.	Declined
---	---	----------

271. Person wants to be assigned a new counselor who will help him get an override so he may go to camp.	Per WAC 138-10-040 The Ombuds may decline to investigate any complaint or may close any investigation of any complaint for any of the following reasons: (d) The Complaint does not allege violation of policy, procedure, or law.	Declined
--	--	----------

272. The individual reports that someone on his tier hangs out with staff and is allowed to help with DOC files. Staff gift him with food, and recently he was seen counting	The individual who reported the concern did not give detailed enough information for this office to pursue the concern. After a full review, the OCO has declined to investigate	Declined
--	--	----------

people and marking them off on the roster sheet.

this concern. Per WAC 138-10-040- The ombuds may decline to investigate any complaint or may close any investigation of any complaint for any of the following reasons: The nature and quality of evidence.

Washington Corrections Center for Women

273. Person was given a tribal check but DOC took a large amount of money that they are not supposed to take.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
274. Person reports issues with the new Securus tablets and wall phones, person says phones are cutting in and out. Person has sent trouble tickets to Securus since September and is told to talk to DOC about it, and DOC tells her to talk to Securus.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
275. Incarcerated individual reports that she has done everything to remove a keep separate. She has submitted all the paperwork to staff and is still being denied. Person states that they were roommates for 7 months before with no issues or behavior, BOEs or infractions.	The OCO has reviewed this concern and will decline to open an investigation. The DOC creates keep separates for documented safety and security concerns- in addition housing assignments are based on facility needs and risk assessments. Per WAC 138-10-040-The ombuds may decline to investigate any complaint or may close any investigation of any complaint for any of the following reasons: The complaint does not allege violation of policy, procedure, or law.	Declined
276. Person reports they followed proper protocol to have a room change with a specific person and were approved by the facility risk management team. Her roommate had a mental health episode a few weeks later and was moved due to safety issues. Person wants to be moved back with that roommate. Person also states that the resolution coordinator did not follow the resolution procedure properly and that the resolution appeal disappeared.	The OCO has declined to investigate this concern. Per WAC 138-10-040 (d), the ombuds may decline to investigate any complaint or may close any investigation of any complaint for any of the following reasons: The complaint does not allege violation of policy, procedure, or law. The DOC Resolution Manual also states that bed/cell assignments are not accepted concerns by the resolution program.	Declined

Washington State Penitentiary

277. Person reports receiving two major infractions and was found guilty. One of the infractions involved DOC not following policy on conducting a urine analysis test. For the other infraction, DOC turned in the	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
---	--	-------------------------------------

	wrong paperwork, he only received an acknowledgement of drug and alcohol testing, not the time requirements.	DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	
278.	Person states that DOC lost all his property when he was transferred to another facility.	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. Included information on how to file a tort claim for missing property per DOC 120.500.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
279.	Person reported his TV being taken away and described being harassed by staff. Person reported that his property was taken after being placed in the intensive management unit in December 2022 after being infracted. Person said staff is telling him he must wait several months to get his property back.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
280.	Person reports being resentenced under the Blake ruling. Statute does not say if previously lost good time will be included in the new sentence. DOC is choosing to interpret that ruling to not include good time. Because of this, person states the ERD has been miscalculated and now he is being held past his original ERD.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
281.	The incarcerated individual reports that phones are broken, and they are not being fixed.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
282.	Person states that he was infracted in retaliation for filing a PREA report and the information in the infraction report is in not accurate. Person was also sanctioned to cell confinement and is afraid the confinement will exacerbate his mental health conditions.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
283.	Person reports that his due process rights were violated. Person says he did not waive his right to a 48-hour notice, sign the paper, had never received any reports or documents and his appeal was destroyed before it was ever filed.	The DOC remanded this infraction for a new hearing. The individual was advised that if they disagree with the new hearing outcome, they will need to appeal the infraction before the OCO can further investigate.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued

284. Person received two major infractions. Person argues that DOC is violation of the State Supreme Court ruling in State v Brown, which mandates treatment rather than punishment.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
285. External complainant reports incarcerated individual being targeted by STG groups over many years.	Per WAC 138-10-040 The Ombuds may decline to investigate any complaint or may close any investigation of any complaint for any of the following reasons: (d) The Complaint does not allege violation of policy, procedure, or law.	Declined
286. A loved one reports they sent a package to a facility and the incarcerated had already been released. They want to know where the package is.	The OCO lacks jurisdiction to investigate this complaint because the complaint relates to an action taken by an agency other than the Washington State Department of Corrections. The OCO lacks jurisdiction to investigate this complaint because the complaint does not involve a person committed to the physical custody of the DOC.	Lacked Jurisdiction
287. A loved one of the incarcerated individual reports that DOC staff made derogatory comments about incarcerated individuals in the unit in front of the individual.	The Incarcerated individual did not respond to the OCO's request to provide additional information within 30 days. The OCO encouraged this person to contact this office if they would like to request assistance.	Person Declined OCO Involvement

Abbreviations & Glossary

ADA: Americans with Disabilities Act

AHCC: Airway Heights Corrections Center

ASR: Accommodation Status Report

BOE: Behavioral Observation Entry

CBCC: Clallam Bay Corrections Center

CCCC: Cedar Creek Corrections Center

CI: Correctional Industries

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

CO: Correctional Officer

CRC: Care Review Committee

CRCC: Coyote Ridge Corrections Center

CUS: Correctional Unit Supervisor

DES: Department of Enterprise Services

DOSA: Drug Offender Sentencing Alternative

EFV: Extended Family Visit

ERD: Earned Release Date

GRE: Graduated Reentry

HCSC: Headquarters Community Screening Committee

HSR: Health Status Report

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

J&S: Judgment and Sentence

MCC: Monroe Correctional Complex

MCCCW: Mission Creek Corrections Center for Women

OCC: Olympic Corrections Center

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

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

SCCC: Stafford Creek Corrections Center

SOTAP: Sex Offender Treatment and Assessment Program

SVP: Sexually Violent Predator

TC: Therapeutic Community

WaONE: Washington ONE ("Offender Needs Evaluation")

WCC: Washington Corrections Center

WCCW: Washington Corrections Center for Women

WSP: Washington State Penitentiary