

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

<b>Case Closure Reason</b>	<b>Meaning</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Assistance Provided</b>	The OCO achieved full or partial resolution of the person’s complaint.	35
<b>Information Provided</b>	The OCO provided self-advocacy information.	55
<b>DOC Resolved</b>	DOC staff resolved the concern prior to OCO action.	12
<b>Administrative Remedies Not Pursued</b>	The incarcerated person did not yet pursue internal resolution per RCW 43.06C.040(2)(b).	44
<b>Substantiated Without Resolution</b>	The OCO verified the concern but was unable to achieve a resolution to the concern.	5
<b>Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate</b>	Insufficient evidence existed to substantiate the concern.	21
<b>No Violation of Policy</b>	The OCO determined that DOC policy was not violated.	41
<b>Unexpected Fatality Review</b>	The incarcerated person died unexpectedly, and the death is under review.	0
<b>Person Left DOC Custody</b>	The incarcerated person left DOC custody prior to OCO action.	2
<b>Person Declined OCO Involvement</b>	The person did not want the OCO to pursue the concern or the OCO received no response to requests for more information.	4
<b>Lacked Jurisdiction</b>	The complaint did not meet OCO’s jurisdictional requirements (typically when complaint is not about an incarcerated person or not about a DOC action).	6
<b>Declined</b>	The OCO declined to investigate because the complaint had already been investigated by this office.	0

# Monthly Outcome Report: August 2022

Complaint Summary	Outcome Summary	Case Closure Reason
<b>Airway Heights Corrections Center</b>		
<p>1. The incarcerated individual reports that he feels excluded from participating in holiday meals because he is on a kosher diet. The individual says that by denying him participation in holiday meals, he is being denied the right to participate in American culture as holidays are cultural, not religious.</p>	<p>The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.</p>	<p>Administrative Remedies Not Pursued</p>
<p>2. The incarcerated individual reports that when he was transferred, he received 13 boxes that included legal work and some store items. He reports that there are three boxes, a typewriter and a keyboard missing. He sent electronic kites to the property room and had family contact property and was told that he already has everything that the previous facility had sent. He reports that when his property was packed up his keyboard and typewriter and other various items were put in the property matrix.</p>	<p>The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.</p>	<p>Administrative Remedies Not Pursued</p>
<p>3. The incarcerated individual reports that the piping in the kitchen was supposed to be fixed, but it is in such bad condition that the facility is going to leave the pipes because it is too bad to fix. The individual also reports that there are cracks in people's rooms and they are not being repaired.</p>	<p>The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.</p>	<p>Administrative Remedies Not Pursued</p>
<p>4. External complainant contacted the OCO on behalf of an incarcerated person to report that other incarcerated individuals are spraying the shower with something that is hurting the incarcerated person's lungs. The individual has a medical history of pneumonia and COVID-19.</p>	<p>The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process. The OCO contacted the Custody Unit Supervisor (CUS); CUS found no recently reported incidents of impacts from sprays in the shower and shared the list of approved cleaners that are used.</p>	<p>Administrative Remedies Not Pursued</p>
<p>5. Incarcerated individual states that they were infraacted for refusing to cell-in but states this incident triggered their PTSD and caused them to freeze so they did not hear the officer's orders. They state they asked for their prescriptions to be reassessed several months earlier but was never seen, and believes that if they had been on the proper medications this incident would not have happened and they would not have been infraacted.</p>	<p>The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.</p>	<p>Administrative Remedies Not Pursued</p>
<p>6. Incarcerated individual states that mental health is interfering with their day-to-day life and causing issues with their reentry. They keep getting sent to HSB for mental health for reasons that do not make sense to them. They feel like mental health is singling them out because of issues with custody staff.</p>	<p>The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.</p>	<p>Administrative Remedies Not Pursued</p>

7.	The incarcerated individual reports that he has been trying to get proper treatment from medical. He has been seen multiple times previously and they gave him antibiotics and told him to soak the affected area but he reports that neither of those things helped. Every time he sees someone they give him the same antibiotics and continuously tell him to soak it. He feels medical is neglecting him. He reports that he sent a grievance today.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process. The individual's grievance is still being processed and is within timelines.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
8.	The incarcerated individual reports that he has received multiple infractions but feels he did not do anything to deserve them. The individual feels he is being targeted and retaliated against after he wrote a resolution request about a DOC staff member.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
9.	The incarcerated individual reports that their unit is on quarantine as of today but they are being allowed to work in the kitchen. The individual reports that other units on quarantine are allowed out to yard.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
10.	The incarcerated individual reports that he has been having issues with heartburn due to diet. He reports that his diet has not been changed by medical and he has not received his Keep on Person (KOP) medications.	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
11.	Incarcerated individual reports receiving an infraction for being out of bounds (709). He states this is his first major infraction and he never received a chance to go to the hearing as he was not put on the callout and was not given a 24-hour notice. DOC told him he waived his rights but says he did not.	The OCO reviewed the infraction and appeal packet and found that the individual signed the right to waive their appearance at the hearing based on his selection of this option on the DOC form "Disciplinary Hearing Notice/Appearance Waiver." However, because the incarcerated individual did intend to attend this hearing, the OCO reached out to DOC about this concern. DOC admitted that the officer who aided in completing this form checked the wrong box and the individual will now receive a new hearing that he can attend. The OCO advised the individual that although the officer had checked the wrong box, the individual himself had completed the rest of the line with his signature and date that did indicate an intention to waive his appearance and should be sure to read the entirety of forms in the future.	Assistance Provided
12.	Incarcerated individual included the OCO on a letter to the Airway Heights Corrections Center (AHCC) leadership responding to the appeal outcome of a recent Behavior Observation Entry (BOE). The individual reports the BOE is not neutral and leadership did not adequately review the BOE for accuracy and DOC policy compliance.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO spoke with facility leadership who agreed to change the BOE to make it accurate and unbiased.	Assistance Provided
13.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns that several months ago they were fired from their job and received a negative behavioral observation log (BOE) and a major infraction for the same incident in the same day. The individual reports they also have not had	The OCO reviewed the concern and verified that the individual did receive a negative BOE and infraction just minutes apart from one another, and a hearing had still not been held. The OCO contacted the facility leadership and raised these two concerns. After reaching out, the OCO reviewed the individual's records and	Assistance Provided

	their hearing and it has been several months.	as the infraction is no longer visible, it appears the hearing was held and DOC decided to keep the BOE as a warning and dropped the infraction.	
14.	The incarcerated individual reports that at his last six month review he was granted 20 days of Good Conduct Time (GCT) restoration. His counselor said that he would assist the individual in resolving the issue but the individual has not heard back.	The OCO provided assistance. After verifying the approval of the Good Conduct Time (GCT) restoration, OCO contacted DOC to inquire about the status of the restoration. DOC staff then identified an error that had been made in processing the restoration. DOC was able to resolve the issue after the OCO's outreach and provide the person with the 20 days of GCT he earned.	Assistance Provided
15.	A loved one of the incarcerated individual reports that the individual's tablet disappeared when staff packed his property to take him to segregation. The individual filed a tort claim and was notified by JPay that a new tablet is on the way to him. The individual is attempting to get a property disposition form signed, but DOC staff are refusing to sign it. The loved one wants to ensure that there are no issues with the individual being issued his new tablet.	The OCO provided assistance. This office communicated with the incarcerated individual's loved one and DOC staff at the facility who will be able to ensure the individual receives his new JPay tablet.	Assistance Provided
16.	Family member reports their incarcerated loved one was taken to Administrative Segregation. He has a scheduled appointment with Department of Children, Youth, and Families (DCYF) and the family is concerned the incarcerated individual will not be able to make it to the hearing because he is in segregation. The family member reports the Correctional Unit Supervisor (CUS) said DOC was transferring him from AHCC and the family is concerned because his support is near AHCC.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO contacted DOC staff who explained to the OCO that they received notification of the meeting and requested information from his attorney about the meeting date and DOC provided information to the attorney about how to schedule the meeting with DOC regardless of if the individual is housed in segregation. The OCO remained in contact with DOC to ensure that DOC provided access to the individual.	Assistance Provided
17.	The incarcerated individual was sent to AHCC to receive a medical consult. Transport failed to get her there on time and she arrived well after her appointment and the doctor was unable to see her. This is the third time she has missed gender affirming care appointments due to staff not ensuring she got to the appointments. The other appointments were late last year and due to issues with DOC handling of telemedicine appointments, the clinic will only see patients in person now. Her living unit is at another facility and she was driven six hours with a special transport to make this appointment but due to being late she missed and will now have to go back to her regular facility. She was told they will have to reschedule a fourth time now and she is concerned about missing more appointments.	The OCO substantiated the appointments were rescheduled multiple times due to DOC IT issues and DOC staff transport delays. The office also substantiated that the specialist no longer provides telehealth appointments through DOC after several appointment issues. The OCO contacted health services to confirm all appointments were rescheduled after the patient contacted the office to report each missed consult. The patient was released from prison prior to DOC resolving the concern. The office followed up with DOC health services and they contacted the specialist to schedule the patient for an appointment after release. DOC confirmed the appointment is scheduled while the patient's insurance coverage is active.	Assistance Provided
18.	Incarcerated person reports that they had an allergic reaction to food provided in one of the meals. Person declared a medical emergency and says the advice they were given was to eat around the food or skip the meal. Person says this amounts to staff misconduct and they are entitled to three meals a day and	The OCO provided assistance. This office contacted DOC health services at this individual's new facility to alert staff to the concern. The OCO later confirmed an allergy Health Status Report (HSR) for no fish/seafood was issued after outreach.	Assistance Provided

being allergic to a food does not give staff the right to refuse full meals.

19. Incarcerated person reports that staff at AHCC interfered with their ability to speak with staff at the OCO and Disability Rights Washington (DRW).	The OCO contacted the AHCC Public Information Officers (PIOs) to discuss cuffing incident and staff interference with OCO and DRW phone calls. The PIO followed up with the Custody Unit Supervisor and unit staff to discuss proper cuffing and call practices for OCO confidential calls. The OCO scheduled a phone call with the individual at their new facility and discussed updates and open cases.	Assistance Provided
20. Family member reports their loved one has suffered vision loss and was told he would not be seen by optometry for over a month. The patient is concerned he may have foreign debris in his eye.	The OCO provided assistance by contacting the Facility Medical Director to request the patient be assessed urgently. The patient was seen by off-site ophthalmology the next day with no acute treatment required. The OCO provided information to the patient and family member about how the patient can access emergent medical, dental, and mental health care.	Assistance Provided
21. The incarcerated individual reports that he is trying to get a prescription cream. He has written numerous kites and was told to wait for the purple slip but never received it. He reports that this has been going on for about four months, and he has filed several grievances about it.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The incarcerated individual called the OCO and reported that the DOC had given them their prescription cream.	DOC Resolved
22. Incarcerated individual was placed under investigation after DOC staff reported they smelled "spice"(synthetic cannabinoids) in their cell. The individual reports the smell was not "spice" but was DOC- allowed incense from his cellmate's religious box. The individual did not receive an infraction as a result of the investigation but was held in the Special Management Unit (SMU) for five days before being moved into another unit. The individual is now in a four-person cell and has not been given their property since they were moved into the SMU. The individual requests OCO assistance in accessing his property and wants to be moved into a two-person cell.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The individual was moved into a two-person cell and DOC provided him with his property after he was in the unit for about five days. Some property items were missing and damaged. The OCO provided information to the individual about how to file a tort claim to be possibly compensated for the broken and lost property.	DOC Resolved
23. External person reported that DOC will not respond to their loved one's grievances.	The OCO will contact the incarcerated individual to confirm they are asking for assistance from this office and send them a confidentiality form to give the external person access to information from this office.	Information Provided
24. Person requested to be screened for a single person cell. Person says that DOC has either given him the run around or they have denied him the opportunity to be screened.	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy DOC 300.380. The OCO contacted Health Services management. The mental health department does not initiate single cell reviews unless there is a need for more restrictive custody based on mental healthcare needs and safety/security risk. Medical is also not able to initiate a housing review without an urgent medical need. Per DOC 300.380, the patient's counselor is the person who would initiate a review when it is time for their classification to be updated. The patient may request at the time of their review that medical and mental health be asked to give their insight, but that is not a guarantee that a single cell placement will be approved by the Headquarters Community Screening Committee (HCSC).	Information Provided

<p>25. External complainant requests status of incarcerated loved one's medical condition and asked if DOC serves milk at the facilities and if her loved one may potentially be lactose intolerant since recent testing came back negative for intestinal infection. Family also requested status of loved one's gender affirming surgery and whether she will be receiving it.</p>	<p>The OCO provided self-advocacy information to the patient and shared with the complainant that the OCO investigative record is confidential and that this office cannot provide medical records or information about an incarcerated patient's conditions to community members. This office provided information for following up if the patient has a medical concern they would like OCO's assistance with.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>26. The incarcerated individual reports the DOC has recently added 14 months to his sentence because his Judgement and Sentence (J&amp;S) did not provide directive from the judge to run the causes concurrent or consecutive and DOC is automatically choosing to run the sentences consecutively. The individual's counselor will not give him information about how to contact the revocation hearings unit to have a re-hearing or appeal the revocation. He was told to contact records but he has done that and he just received the records themselves with no other explanation.</p>	<p>The OCO provided detailed information regarding the reason for the addition of 14 months to his sentence. Per RCW 9.94A.589(2)(a) "Whenever a person while under sentence for conviction of a felony commits another felony and is sentenced to another term of confinement, the latter term of confinement shall not begin until expiration of all prior terms of confinement. However, any terms of community custody shall run concurrently to each other, unless the court pronouncing the current sentence expressly orders that they be served consecutively." To run the causes consecutively is not a decision that was made by DOC. When an individual is revoked from their lesser confinement, DOC does implement the revocation but DOC must refer to the original J&amp;S to calculate time. The individual's J&amp;S does not specify running the causes concurrently so DOC followed the RCW. This may be re-heard in court to be reviewed by a judge. The OCO sent the individual detailed information about how to have the J&amp;S re-heard including contact information for the county of conviction.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>27. The incarcerated individual reports that they attempted to send out a manila envelope with an OCO Review Request form and documentation to the OCO. However, this letter went into the mail and was never sent to OCO. The DOC sent the envelope back to the incarcerated individual at their new facility several months later. This person does not understand why their mail was not sent to the OCO when they originally put it in the mail.</p>	<p>The OCO provided information regarding the next steps this person can take to resolve the issue in a letter. This office recommended that they file a grievance against the mailroom that failed to send out their mail.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>28. The incarcerated individual would like to receive a new mattress, as he has a documented medical condition. The individual reports that he has spoken to several DOC staff members who referred him to medical, and medical says they cannot issue HSRs for mattresses. The individual filed a resolution request, and the response was that that mattresses are only replaced for wear and tear.</p>	<p>The OCO provided information regarding the COVID-19 supply chain issues which have impacted the facility receiving new mattresses to replace unserviceable mattresses in the living units. This office also informed the individual that through the HSR process, bed wedges, pillows, and positioning devices may be issued if deemed medically necessary.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>29. Community member called to report a concern that impacts the incarcerated population. Person alleges that multiple units are not being called for night pill line and medications are not being taken to incarcerated individuals. Custody staff are impacting medication access during lockdown.</p>	<p>The OCO reported the concerns to health services and custody staff to ensure their awareness of this incident. The office substantiated missed medication deliveries to the living areas during COVID isolation and quarantine. Scheduled movements had resumed prior to OCO contact. The DOC reports the nursing manager and captain are in consultation about recent closure of late night pill line due to overlap with count. The OCO also provided the individual with information</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>

on how incarcerated individuals can contact the office to report concerns directly.

30.	The incarcerated individual reports that his roommate had two people visiting near their cell. Officers went to investigate and conducted a search and found a piece of suboxone. The individual's roommate admitted to being responsible for the suboxone. During the search, officers took the individual's Native American sacred pipe. The officers took the sacred pipe and put it in an evidence bag because it could not be identified. When the pipe was identified, the individual reports that the officer forgot to take the pipe out of evidence and return it to him and now the DOC cannot locate his sacred pipe.	The OCO provided information regarding how the individual can file a Tort Claim if his property has been lost. This office also communicated with DOC staff and requested they do a thorough search for the pipe. DOC staff reviewed video footage and interviewed staff, but it was not located.	Information Provided
31.	External complainant reports DOC has denied incarcerated person gender affirming surgery. This person has seen a doctor outside of DOC and the doctor recommended the surgery. They think that DOC has denied the surgery to save money.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of the DOC Health Plan. The OCO contacted DOC health services staff. DOC reports the offsite transgender care specialist requested additional paperwork. DOC completed paperwork and sent to specialist for review and now the appointment is pending scheduling. The OCO could not find evidence to substantiate that DOC has denied gender affirming surgery as the patient is active in process of specialist review and scheduling.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
32.	The incarcerated person has been having pains in their right side. The test came back stating they have a gallstone blocking their gallbladder. The specialist prescribed two medications. The person reports that they are not receiving the Tylenol 500; DOC told him to order it from commissary but he needs to consume more than he is allowed purchase each month. He asked what the care plan was as he was informed at the outside medical appointment that the gallbladder would need to be removed. The facility medical stated it does not seem to be blocking it so they will not treat it.	The OCO substantiated that the patient has a gallstone, however, DOC is following medical specialist recommendations of continued monitoring. Patient continues to receive GI workups per specialist recommendations; follow up scheduled. DOC reviewed patient's commissary and could not find a recent record of Tylenol purchases. The patient can utilize this medication and if it is not helpful, can follow up with medical to discuss options. Records indicated purchase of naproxen which is not recommended in conjunction with a current diagnosis. This information was provided to the patient directly.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
33.	The incarcerated individual reports that he has knee issues and medical staff report he has mild arthritis. He says he is taking 3200 mg of Tylenol per day and now has blood clots in his lungs. He also is diabetic and has been on call outs for three times a day but has not been going for insulin and reports DOC is not saying anything.	The OCO contacted health services to request information about the patient's insulin access. The OCO reviewed this concern without a related grievance due to the patient's report of insulin access concerns. This office substantiated blood clots identified via imaging about a year ago with the recommended treatment of lifelong anticoagulation; resent results unremarkable. DOC reports the patient has a history of refusing medication as substantiated via medical notes. The OCO confirmed the patient is being provided insulin access, appropriate HSRs for knee pain, and no indication of foot issues from patient during recent medical appointments.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
34.	Incarcerated individual reports he was assaulted in one unit so DOC moved him to another. Friends of the assailant were then moved into that unit, so DOC moved the individual into another unit. The individual is concerned about the current unit because a person he knew while he was not incarcerated is housed	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO found that DOC staff acted upon reports that the individual was not safe and moved him to three different units before requesting another facility placement option for this person. DOC staff created a plan to have the individual moved to a residential treatment unit (RTU).	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate

there and is harassing him. The person he knew from before his incarceration is asking others in the unit to file Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) reports about him which has resulted in him being moved from the most recent unit.

<p>35. Incarcerated individual states that they had a trial and was sentenced to 57 months and no supervision. The individual states that the lawyer who signed off on their case had ordered two months of supervision after their release from DOC, but this is incorrect. DOC is saying that they will need an address to release. They state they were not at the hearing and believes that is a due process violation. They want to be released on their date with no supervision because this is wrong, as the lawyer opened their case again three years after sentencing and added more supervision.</p>	<p>The OCO lacks jurisdiction to investigate the concern as the complaint relates to the person's underlying criminal conviction, which is an issue that is not under OCO jurisdiction.</p>	<p>Lacked Jurisdiction</p>
<p>36. Incarcerated person reports they were infractioned for being out of bounds in another person's cell. Person says the other person was also infractioned, but had their infraction reduced and they do not think it is fair that theirs was not also reduced. Person says they are being punished for something they did not do.</p>	<p>The OCO reviewed the infraction and appeal packet and find there is evidence to substantiate the 709 infraction as the element "the offender is not assigned to the cell and does not have permission to be there" was met when they were seen by a DOC staff member in another person's cell giving the other person a haircut. This infraction was not appropriate to be lowered to a 210 as the person had already been given a 210 previously, also had a negative behavioral observation entry (BOE) for being in another person's cell, and had received another 709 all in the past year.</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy</p>
<p>37. A family member of the incarcerated individual reports that he was taken to SMU and has not been able to use a phone or receive or send letters. The family member reports that the individual has not been infractioned or disciplined. The family member reports that the individual has not received any of her letters, and thought that mail had to be given to incarcerated individuals within two days.</p>	<p>The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The individual received a major infraction, and per DOC 460.050 Attachment 2, mandatory sanctions include interruption/restriction of correspondence, telephone, and/or electronic communication privileges.</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy</p>
<p>38. Incarcerated person expressed concerns about being infractioned following a cell search and believes this to be retaliation for an investigation and lawsuit their roommate is involved in with the same officer.</p>	<p>The OCO reviewed the infraction and appeal packet and the hearing audio. The 602 infraction was substantiated when the element: "possessing a weapon or sharpened instrument" was met by three razor blades being located in the individual's cell. The individual also made conflicting statements about the location and presence of the razor blades and appears to have been aware of the presence of the razor blades in their cell. The individual also mentioned concerns about timeframes not being followed in their appeal. However, per WAC 137.28.400, timeframes are non-jurisdictional and failure by DOC to abide by the timeframes is not grounds for dismissal of an infraction.</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy</p>
<p>39. Person reports talking with the receiving facility and expressing concerns during her housing reviews. She was told by DOC staff that headquarters demoted her custody for "refusing transfer." She appealed to DOC HQ but has not received any responses. She was</p>	<p>The OCO contacted DOC health services at current facility to confirm the patient can access medications and that the patient is scheduled for healthcare follow up. Through an extensive records review and contact with DOC, the office found that DOC did not</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy</p>



transferred without notice to camp. Person reports there is no access to pill line at camp and she is concerned about accessing medications. She previously talked with her mental health counselor who recommended a single cell but DOC denied the single cell placement; she submitted an appeal.

approve the individual for a single cell per policy DOC 420.140.

40. The incarcerated individual's counselor told him that he has a warrant from another state. Detectives came to the facility with a search warrant to collect a sample of the individual's DNA. The individual had his family contact the county where the warrant originated, and were told that the individual does not have any warrants. The individual is trying to get work release and this issue is preventing him from doing that.	The OCO confirmed that the incarcerated individual has a felony warrant from another state and will be extradited upon release. The OCO explained DOC 390.590 which states that individuals with a felony warrant are not eligible for a partial confinement program.	No Violation of Policy
41. External complainant reports patient has not been treated for what seems to be an infection.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of the DOC Health Plan. The OCO contacted DOC Health Services and Facility Medical Director and reviewed this patient's records. DOC reports and records indicate that the patient has received treatment and follow up, including negative test results for infection. Additionally, DOC staff indicated that the patient attended a recent appointment and did not report any new medical concerns. The OCO verified that medical procedure previously canceled has been rescheduled and that DOC plans to continue monitoring the patient.	No Violation of Policy
42. An external person reports that their loved one has been in Administrative Segregation for eighteen days and has not been informed of the decision made in his hearing. The individual was placed in quarantine even though he did not have COVID-19.	The OCO could not identify evidence to substantiate a violation of policy by DOC. An incarcerated individual can be held for thirty days in administrative segregation, and the DOC can file an extension if they need more time for their investigation. This information can be found in policy 320.200. This person's facility was on COVID outbreak status at the time of this concern.	No Violation of Policy
43. The patient reports that his porcelain tooth came out and he has tried to get dental attention and was told there is nothing they can do besides pull the tooth. He feels that removing the tooth will cause additional damage. He reports his tongue is bleeding every day from rubbing on the stub. He still has the tooth and would like to get a new post for the tooth, a cap, or a flipper.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. Per the Health Plan, Dental crowns, implants, and veneers are considered by DOC to be Level 3: Not Medically Necessary Care. Not authorized to be provided. Services associated with the diagnoses listed in Level 3, even if appropriate, cannot be authorized by an individual provider or CRC. Incarcerated individuals may receive Level 3 care under DOC 600.020 Offender Paid Health Care at their own expense if certain conditions are met.	No Violation of Policy
44. The incarcerated person was infraacted for refusing to participate in an assessment for substance abuse treatment. This person reports that they have completed similar programs during past incarcerations, are no longer using drugs or alcohol, and are not required to participate in such programs per their Judgement and Sentence. The person says DOC is unlawfully imposing the requirement to be assessed based on factors that are not relevant to their current incarceration.	The OCO could not identify evidence to substantiate a violation of policy by DOC. Policy 580.000 states that individuals who refuse admission, do not complete the treatment program due to their refusal to continue treatment, or are out of compliance with program requirements will be subject to disciplinary action. Since this person refused their substance abuse assessment, they violated Policy 580.000, which resulted in their infraction.	No Violation of Policy

45.	A loved one called on behalf of the incarcerated individual and reports that the individual recently had surgery and was moved to a four person cell temporarily. The loved one reports that the individual was prescribed narcotics after surgery and his cellmates are asking him to check his narcotics. The loved one also says that incarcerated individual should have access to food purchased by loved ones and a TV while he rests and heals.	The incarcerated individual advised the OCO they did not want the OCO to investigate the complaint.	Person Declined OCO Involvement
46.	A loved one of the incarcerated individual reports that when the individual was placed in the IMU, his property was not packed properly and he was not given his Keep on Person (KOP) medications. The loved one also reports that the individual only has a toothbrush and no other personal hygiene items.	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
47.	The incarcerated individual reports that he filed a grievance and the coordinator sat on it for two weeks before responding. The grievance coordinator told him to appeal the decision by sending it to headquarters. When he sent it to headquarters, headquarters told him that he does not need to send it to headquarters but instead write "appeal" at the top of the grievance form and send it through the facility. This person is frustrated because that's what they did, and they were told something different by the grievance coordinator.	The OCO was able to substantiate the concern, but was not able to achieve a resolution. The DOC is currently updating the resolution program to mitigate delays of this nature.	Substantiated Without Resolution
48.	Patient reports that the dentist told him more than one year ago that he had cavities and should come back within 90 days to fix them. To date, he has been seen for three cleanings but has received no treatment for the cavities. DOC says they are only doing extractions, not fixing cavities. He has grieved and it was informally resolved by telling him that he is on the waiting list.	The OCO contacted DOC health services and confirmed the patient is on waitlist for dental care and cavities are deemed nonemergent per COVID protocols.	Substantiated Without Resolution

### Clallam Bay Corrections Center

49.	The incarcerated individual reports that he is not being given the requirement of nail clippers and razors during his shower rotation.	The OCO provided assistance. This office contacted DOC staff in the unit and asked that recent move sheets during the individual's shower rotation be reviewed. DOC staff found that the individual has been given a razor and nail clippers consistently, with the exception of relief staff being unfamiliar with the process. This office confirmed with DOC staff that they will go over the shower rotation process with new and relief staff to ensure the individual is able to use a razor and nail clippers during his shower rotation.	Assistance Provided
50.	Incarcerated individual reports a Correctional Officer (CO) working in the facility chapel wrote a negative Behavior Observation Entry (BOE) on him that was not issued to him at the time the BOE was drafted per DOC 300.010 Behavior Observations. The individual later discovered the BOE and appealed it to the Correctional Program Manager (CPM). The appeal was not considered	The OCO provided assistance by contacting the Superintendent and asking for a review of the Behavior Observation Entry. The Superintendent agreed to change the language in the BOE.	Assistance Provided

and the BOE is still on the individual's central file.

<p>51. The incarcerated individual reports concerns regarding the DOC not providing a cost of living pay increase. The individual reports that commissary items prices continue to be raised, but incarcerated individuals have not been provided a pay increase in many years and the current maximum compensation amount of \$55 a month is not enough pay. The individual requests that the DOC secretary raise the maximum compensation amount for incarcerated individuals.</p>	<p>The OCO provided information regarding the process by which DOC may increase compensation for incarcerated individuals. RCW Chapter 72.64 and DOC 700.100 Class III Work Programs govern incarcerated individuals' pay. Per 72.64.020, "[t]he secretary shall make the necessary rules and regulations governing the employment of prisoners, the conduct of all such operations, and the disposal of the products thereof, under such restrictions as provided by law." The OCO reviewed DOC 700.100 Class III Work Programs which states, "[w]orkers will be compensated for hours worked. Compensation must be supported within facility budgeted funds and will not exceed \$55 per month. Exceptions to compensation, including flat rate compensation assignments, require written, advance approval from the Assistant Secretary for Prisons/designee."</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
--	---	-----------------------------

**Coyote Ridge Corrections Center**

<p>52. Family member states DOC is not meeting the needs of their loved one. He is suffering from multiple gastrointestinal issues and is not receiving treatment after kiting medical. They want the patient transferred back to their previous facility.</p>	<p>The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.</p>	<p>Administrative Remedies Not Pursued</p>
<p>53. Person was transferred to CRCC, his property went to Stafford. It has been over a week and he has not gotten any traction in getting his property back.</p>	<p>The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.</p>	<p>Administrative Remedies Not Pursued</p>
<p>54. The incarcerated individual reports that the cable channels at the facility have been out of service for two weeks, and a DOC staff member said that there is a part that is needed so it cannot be fixed. The individual has no idea when it will be fixed. The individual's unit is quarantine and they cannot have yard. The only entertainment they currently have is the TV.</p>	<p>The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.</p>	<p>Administrative Remedies Not Pursued</p>
<p>55. The incarcerated individual reports that he is trying to get a rental TV. The individual filed a grievance and was told he is on the list for a rental TV, but that was months ago. The individual reports that several people got their TVs recently, but he did not get his rental TV. The individual feels as though no one cares or is looking out for him.</p>	<p>The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.</p>	<p>Administrative Remedies Not Pursued</p>
<p>56. The incarcerated individual reports that DOC staff are leaving the count lights on for an extended period of time at night. The individual says that sometimes they are being left on for hours after count, causing sleep deprivation and headaches. The individual says that he received conflicting info from staff regarding when the lights should be turned off.</p>	<p>The OCO provided assistance. This office discussed the concern with DOC staff in the unit, but the individual reported that the concern had not been resolved. The OCO then spoke with leadership at the facility who, after being made aware of the concern, agreed to ensure that count lights will no longer be kept on later than necessary at night.</p>	<p>Assistance Provided</p>

57. Loved one of an incarcerated individual reports that they were denied Extended Family Visits (EFVs) due to the method in which they got married. Loved one reports that DOC did not explain to them the process at any point during the time that they were getting the ring approval.	The OCO provided information regarding how to apply for a marriage through DOC. Because the marriage was facilitated at a county jail, the couple did not complete the documents required by DOC to recognize the marriage. Once the couple completes the correct documentation, they may re-apply for EFVs.	Information Provided
58. Incarcerated person states they are being held past their early release date. They were put in administrative segregation because they threatened staff for holding them past their release date. This person has not been able to establish an address and has a housing voucher. They are concerned that DOC is going to hold them until their Max date and will not work to find an address for them.	The OCO reviewed the individual's concern and determined the individual has not yet reached their early release date and DOC has been working on their release plan for months, however nobody has accepted them yet. DOC can, by law, keep someone in custody until their max date. The person was advised that they can ask their counselor about the housing voucher, as they will have more information regarding the process than the OCO.	Information Provided
59. The incarcerated individual reports that the assessments DOC uses to determine eligibility for Graduated Re-Entry (GRE) are too selective. The individual was told by his classification counselor that DOC will never accept people convicted of sex offenses for GRE. He has researched the RCW related to GRE and none of limitations for acceptance into the program apply to him.	The OCO provided information regarding DOC's Graduated Re-Entry (GRE) program. The OCO reviewed the individual's central file and found the individual is not yet eligible for GRE and can apply when they get closer to their release date. The OCO provided information related to the GRE program and the different tracks that DOC makes available for differing situations, including based on the type of conviction they are serving time for. The OCO explained when to apply, and what requirements need to be met prior to applying for the best chance of approval.	Information Provided
60. The incarcerated individual reports they sent two record requests to DOC but no one has responded. The person reports they sent the requests over a month ago and have not even received an acknowledgment letter.	The OCO provided information regarding the contact information for the DOC Public Records office. The OCO encouraged this person to contact DOC Public Records directly and inquire about their public disclosure request.	Information Provided
61. The incarcerated individual reports that nothing has been done for his release plan. The individual says he has not received responses regarding GRE.	The OCO provided information regarding the incarcerated individual's screening for GRE. The individual was denied GRE at the initial screening, but was later approved by the Headquarters Community Screening Committee (HCSC). This office spoke with the individual's counselor who confirmed his Release Plan (ORP) is in work, and will be submitting a housing voucher within 60 days of the individual's ERD as outlined in the Reentry Housing Assistance Program.	Information Provided
62. Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about being told they were eligible for the graduated re-entry (GRE) program and then having their submitted address denied and being told they are actually not eligible due to their charges.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The individual was denied from the Graduate Re-Entry (GRE) program due to community concerns and other facts from their history. This office provided information regarding their option to appeal the GRE denial.	Information Provided
63. The incarcerated individual reports DOC received two stimulus checks for him that he has not received. He reports that he is concerned because he is attempting to get answers about where the checks are and DOC staff is not responding to him. The individual reports the checks were sent to the "blue bag program" and he hasn't heard about where they are since DOC told him they went to the "blue bag program." The individual reports he was told by OCO he would	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The DOC confirmed to OCO that two stimulus checks were provided to the individual in 2020 and 2021. The OCO provided information to the individual about how to make contact to the IRS about receiving the third stimulus check, which DOC does not have record of the individual receiving. The OCO reviewed the individual's employment and found that he is no longer employed in the kitchen.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate

receive the checks but he still hasn't, which is concerning to him. He also reports he cannot continue to be employed in the kitchen because it is a hostile working environment.

64.	External person reports that her loved one has not received refills for his prescription and been out of medicine for the last two days. Person further reports that staff are yelling "mainline" instead of using the intercom and incarcerated person is missing breakfast because they cannot hear staff yell.	The external person did not name the incarcerated individual in the concern. Without identifying information, this office has insufficient evidence to investigate these concerns.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
65.	Incarcerated individual reports the bar association is trying to provide him legal documents that were rejected by the mailroom. The individual needs to get approval from the superintendent to receive the documents per policy. The individual has sent kites to the Superintendent and other DOC staff about the approval. The individual requests assistance from OCO to get the documentation he needs from the bar association.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO reviewed kite responses from the superintendent upholding the decision to deny the documents into the facility. DOC staff responded to the request for approval prior to the individual's contact with OCO. DOC decided not to allow the documents as they violate DOC 450.100 Mail for Incarcerated Individuals. The decision to deny the documents was reviewed by the facility superintendent and DOC headquarters and was upheld.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
66.	External person reports that the new requirements for storing property are not conducive to aligning with the Norwegian prison model nor does it provide enough storage space for personal property for people who are incarcerated long-term.	The OCO has not received any concerns from the incarcerated population regarding this issue at the facility and the concern does not identify an incarcerated person who is raising the concern. At this time this office has insufficient evidence to substantiate.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
67.	Incarcerated person reports ongoing dental problems stemming from grinding his teeth in his sleep and needs to have a tooth fixed. However, dental will only pull the tooth instead of providing a partial or mouth guard. Person says dental told him that if the tooth does get pulled they may give him a mouth guard.	The OCO could not identify evidence to substantiate a violation of policy by DOC; the particular dental procedures the patient is requesting are not covered under the DOC Health Plan. The OCO asked DOC to provide information to the patient regarding Offender Paid Health Plan options.	No Violation of Policy
68.	The incarcerated individual reports that their loved one received a final rejection for visitor approval, however, they do not have a no contact order.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. DOC has identified current safety and security concerns that prevent the individual's loved one from having their visitation application approved, which is in line with DOC 450.300 Attachment 1.	No Violation of Policy
69.	Incarcerated individual was approved by the facility for an escorted leave for a deathbed visit for his mother. Headquarters made the final decision to deny the leave reporting that low staffing levels made it impossible. As a result, he was unable to visit his mother.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The DOC headquarters staff denied the visit due to staffing levels as well as safety concerns related to conducting the visit in a private residence. DOC denied the escorted leave in compliance with DOC 420.110 Escorted Leaves and Furloughs. The individual was able to have a video visit with his mother before her passing.	No Violation of Policy
70.	Incarcerated person reports they are not receiving proper medical attention for two conditions and is experiencing severe pain because of one of the conditions. Person is considering declaring a medical emergency.	The OCO could not identify evidence to substantiate a violation of the DOC Health Plan. The OCO contacted health services and confirmed an active treatment plan and history of x-rays, follow ups, and updated treatment for broken bone. DOC reports rheumatology consult, six-month lab work, additional consult, and follow up x-rays are all scheduled.	No Violation of Policy
71.	Person says DOC needs to change the current position on how dental care is	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by	No Violation of Policy

provided to include preventative maintenance and repairs. Person previously won a motion in court that changed dental polices in the county jail and he would like DOC to align with this level of care.

DOC. Section VI(C) of the Washington DOC Health Plan defines "Level 3" care as "not medically necessary care." Dental crowns, implants, and veneers are classified by DOC as Level 3 treatments. Services associated with the diagnoses listed in Level 3, even if appropriate, cannot be authorized by an individual provider or the DOC Care Review Committee. Incarcerated individuals may receive Level 3 care under DOC 600.020 Offender Paid Health Care at their own expense if certain conditions are met.

<p>72. Incarcerated person reports that a letter sent to family and friends was rejected for threatening language and they were subsequently infracted. Person says that they often relieve stress about their current incarceration status with family and friends and they have not had mail rejected because of that previously. Person feels that DOC staff misinterpreted the context of their letter and believes their first amendment rights were violated.</p>	<p>The OCO reviewed the infraction and appeal packet, the hearing audio and the letter that was rejected and is the subject of the infraction. The OCO's extensive review determined that there is evidence to substantiate the infraction for using abusive or harassing language and the infraction using intimidation against any person. The OCO also identified evidence to substantiate the infraction for threatening which was reduced by DOC to a general infraction for abuse of language.</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy</p>
<p>73. Patient states that an unknown staff member was present during his telehealth appointment. The staff member called custody when the patient raised his voice and the appointment was ended. The patient is concerned there was a HIPPA violation.</p>	<p>The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO contacted Health Services management and confirmed the staff member present was medical staff and that they had consulted with management before involving custody. It is standard procedure for Health Services staff to be present to facilitate telehealth visits.</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy</p>
<p>74. External person reported that an altercation occurred when incarcerated individuals were waiting in pill line. Officers had the individuals on the ground and sprayed them with OC multiple times. OC spray also got on the rest of the individuals in line and the individuals sprayed were not offered clean up.</p>	<p>The OCO reviewed the incident and contacted the DOC leadership at the facility regarding the concern. This office verified there was a multi-man fight that occurred in the pill line where OC spray was used by DOC staff to stop the fight. Incarcerated individuals who were not involved in the fight did come in contact with small amounts of the OC spray. The OCO substantiated they were not offered clean up until hours after the incident.</p>	<p>Substantiated Without Resolution</p>
<p>75. Patient states psyllium has been unavailable from DOC pharmacy for months.</p>	<p>The OCO was able to substantiate this concern, but was not able to achieve a resolution. The medication, psyllium, is on backorder. The DOC pharmacy has worked with their wholesaler to acquire the medication but there is no current date for being able to fulfill all prescriptions for psyllium regularly. The orders are being filled as the medication becomes available.</p>	<p>Substantiated Without Resolution</p>

**Larch Corrections Center**

<p>76. Person states they want to make sure that it is clear that their concern is that corrections staff sought to prevent him from receiving medical care, not with medical staff.</p>	<p>The OCO shared information about previous casework with individual via letter. The person was transferred from the facility the family member submitted the staff conduct concern about. This office reviewed and could not identify any related infractions or level II staff conduct grievances. Since the individual was transferred, the casework focused on confirming the patient was able to access the medical care reported by the family. The OCO closed the case after confirming the patient was scheduled for bloodwork and an MRI after transfer.</p>	<p>Administrative Remedies Not Pursued</p>
<p>77. Incarcerated individual states they were infracted for contraband. The evidence was a scrap of graph paper that the</p>	<p>The OCO reviewed the infraction and appeal packet, hearing audio and photo evidence, and find there is evidence to substantiate the</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy</p>

individual said was on the floor and from the school. This was taken into evidence and subsequently tested, they asked to be present during the testing of the paper but was not given the opportunity.

infraction for receiving a positive test for an unauthorized drug (752) when officers found a piece of notebook paper under the individual's bed during a random cell search that appeared adulterated. The paper tested positive for meth as confirmed through photos of the paper with the positive test results. The individual expressed concerns about not being able to be present for the testing. There is currently not a DOC policy that allows an individual to be present for a testing. The individual expressed concerns about not being able to have the paper sent out to an outside lab for additional testing. Per DOC policy, as located on DOC form 05-093, an incarcerated individual does not have a right to supplemental testing. The individual expressed concerns about not getting to see the paper that was taken from their cell. Per DOC policy, as located on DOC form 05-093, an incarcerated individual does not have a right to examine physical evidence. Because the paper had already been taken to the evidence locker, by the time the individual returned to their cell, the paper was considered physical evidence and they did not have a right to examine it. In accordance with DOC Policy 420.320(VII)(B), the DOC staff who confiscated the paper left a cell search report notifying the individual that the paper had been taken.

78. Incarcerated person expressed concerns about receiving an infraction for their cellmate's contraband during a cell search. They state their cellmate confessed to possessing the contraband but they were still infractioned.	The OCO reviewed the infraction and appeal packet and hearing audio and find there is evidence to substantiate the 752 infraction for a receiving a positive test for an unauthorized drug when the pipes that were found on the table in the common area of the cell tested positive for marijuana. Because the pipes as well as other items including arching tools and an altered power strip were found in the common area of the cell, despite the cellmate claiming possessing, the individual was infractioned for a "cell tag" which is allowable per DOC policy.	No Violation of Policy
---	---	------------------------

**Mission Creek Corrections Center for Women**

79. Incarcerated person reports they were infractioned for communicating with another incarcerated individual. However, person says the other individual was not in a correctional facility as stated under infraction 725. Person says if anything, they would be guilty of the minor infraction 303.	The OCO reviewed the infraction and appeal packet, JPay messages and hearing audio and find there is evidence to substantiate the 725 infraction as the element of "failing to adhere to facility correspondence rules or policy regulations" was met when the incarcerated person messaged an individual who was in an alternative incarceration program, which is still considered a form of incarceration. The incarcerated person states they did not know that the individual was considered incarcerated as the other person just added themselves to their JPay. However, from the contents of the message the incarcerated person sent to the individual, as well as messaging them multiple times, it appears they were familiar with this person.	No Violation of Policy
--	---	------------------------

**Monroe Correctional Complex**

80. The incarcerated individual reports that he is in pain from hernia surgery and is not receiving adequate pain relief.	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
---	--	-------------------------------------

DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.

81.	The incarcerated individual reports that the phones have not been working properly, and he has not been able to make outside calls since last month.	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
82.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about being placed in segregation for possibly bringing in contraband while on a visit but says there is no evidence to support this and continues to be harassed by staff and feels DOC planted this. Additionally, the infraction paperwork was served on another individual. The individual states they have been trying to appeal it but DOC will not pick up that particular kite.	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
83.	Incarcerated person reports that they are attempting to create a pilot program for incarcerated individuals within the facility. However, while seeking approval, DOC staff have been giving them the “run around” by ignoring kites, letters and verbal requests to discuss the possibility.	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
84.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns related to their infraction including being placed on cell confinement for the incorrect infraction number, the infraction paperwork not being time stamped, not signing the paperwork themselves, one of the infractions being incorrectly listed and receiving a sanction of 30 days without TV, which the individual reports should not occur due to Covid policy.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process. The individual did not appeal this infraction.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
85.	The incarcerated person reports they wrote a grievance on a staff member in their unit pertaining to a PREA allegation. The person reports that staff wanted him to stay in that unit for an extra 120 days.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
86.	Incarcerated individual states that they are being harassed and trying to be instigated by staff. They report multiple incidents have occurred where staff will bump into them to try and get them infractioned.	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
87.	The incarcerated individual reports that they are submitting grievances against a specific staff member. However, they are not receiving the paper copy responses from the grievance department, and they believe that the staff member they are grieving is intercepting them. This person filed another grievance on this same staff member several days ago, and they have not received a response yet from the resolution department. This person reports that staff is intentionally not giving them their grievances so that they cannot appeal the grievance	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process. The OCO’s review determined that this individual had two resolution requests that were being processed.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued



response within the appropriate timeframes.

88.	Outside organization reports DOC may be impacting the incarcerated individual's phone call access.	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
89.	The incarcerated individual attempted to request shelving for his current cell through the ADA Coordinator and correctional unit supervisor. However, they have not responded.	The incarcerated person has not pursued an internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
90.	Incarcerated person was given a Health Status Report (HSR) for a cervical medical pillow but was denied their request for a medical or new type of mattress by the Care Review Committee (CRC). Person states they have multiple medical conditions that cause them significant pain exacerbated by the current mattress.	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. Mattress concerns can be grieved through the DOC Resolution Program. CRC decisions can be appealed to HQ CRC Appeals Committee (Department of Corrections PO BOX 41123 Olympia WA 98504) within 5 days of receiving DOC 13-182 Patient Notification of Care Review Committee Decision, and must be submitted on form DOC 13-578.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
91.	Person is interested in choosing a different injection site. She also reports her dead name was listed on recent medical paperwork. Patient was transferred and also wants to confirm podiatry specialist still scheduled.	The OCO contacted the DOC Trans Healthcare Navigator who worked with the Facility Medical Director to update the patient's injection preferences. DOC is aware of the legal name issue and has met/planned around OMNI including "dead names" in certain areas even when someone's legal name is updated. HQ leadership is actively working with the IT department to address the issue. The OCO confirmed medical records have updated legal name, and substantiated a recent document that included the patient's new legal name and old name in parenthesis. The OCO also confirmed the podiatry appointment is scheduled and met with the patient via phone. Patient confirmed she has received recent lab work.	Assistance Provided
92.	Incarcerated individual was returned to prison after absconding from his electric home monitoring. This individual reports he is being held in the intensive management unit (IMU) until he is classified and transferred to another facility. The individual reports the Community Corrections Officer (CCO) took his phone at the time of arrest and asked if he had anyone available to pick the phone up. The individual explained to the CCO that his roommate could pick up the phone but the phone has been dead ever since. The individual wants to ensure that his roommate has his phone and would like to get ahold of his roommate so he can get some phone numbers from the phone to contact his family.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO reviewed the individual's central file and found that the phone is being held as evidence because items found on the phone violated his community custody conditions. The OCO spoke with the individual's counselor, who agreed to provide the individual with the emergency contact numbers in his file to be able to contact his family.	Assistance Provided

93.	The incarcerated individual reported they are not receiving mental health services for their rape and gender dysphoria. Their main concern is that they want to be transferred to WCCW and they are upset that this has not happened yet; instead they are sitting indefinitely in segregation.	The OCO has reviewed multiple concerns from this individual regarding mental health treatment, segregation placement and a transfer to WCCW. The OCO verified that the individual is currently housed at a different facility, is not in segregation and has been seen by mental health multiple times. At this time, DOC will not transfer them to WCCW.	DOC Resolved
94.	The incarcerated individual was scheduled for surgery, and it has been canceled. As a result, his move from medium custody to camp is on a medical hold.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO determined that the DOC was able to reschedule this person's surgery, and the surgery has been completed.	DOC Resolved
95.	The incarcerated person is trying to contact the U.S. Marshal Department or the Washington State Police to make a statement about crimes he witnessed when he was younger. This person reports that when he talked with mental health staff, he was not taken seriously, and staff made notations in his records that do not accurately reflect the information he was reporting.	The OCO provided this individual the contact information for the U.S. Marshal Department and Washington State Police in a letter.	Information Provided
96.	The incarcerated individual reports that his grandparents have applied to visit him but have not received a response or rejection. They are elderly and it would be a long trip. The individual's aunt has been approved.	The OCO provided information regarding the visitation applications for the individual's grandparents, and what steps they can take to move forward in their applications.	Information Provided
97.	Incarcerated individual filed a grievance about a staff member disclosing to two other incarcerated individuals that someone had snitched. Person states this makes them worried about working with mental health staff further. They got a grievance response that this issue does not personally impact them so he cannot grieve it. The individual states they believe a policy needs to be changed and they might have to file a PRP (personal restraint petition) because of this. He wants to be able to write a grievance, and he wants the officers not to have the ability to intercept the paper copies before it gets to the incarcerated individuals.	There is insufficient evidence to substantiate this concern as this incident pertains to secondhand information that the individual heard from other incarcerated individuals.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
98.	Incarcerated person reports that there are problems with the Resolution Program and illegal tactics are being used. Person states that their grievances are being returned often with rewrite instructions, citing legal language as the reason. Person says their grievances pertain to laws and policies so that would have to be included in the grievance and by returning the grievances, this disallows them to exhaust the administrative process.	OCO staff were unable to verify this concern as there is insufficient evidence. The individual was advised they would need to provide the Log ID of which grievance they are concerned about so that this office can review that particular one.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
99.	The incarcerated individual reports that he continues to have problems with a staff member who infracts and threatens him. The staff member told him she would write him up for sexual harassment if he did not fix his shirt. The individual reports that this is retaliation for the PREA he filed on her friend.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO reviewed this person's file and determined that they have not had an infraction since the beginning of this year, and the OCO could not find evidence of the staff member harassing them.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
100.	Incarcerated person filed a tort claim for a watch that was broken when property	The OCO does not have jurisdiction over the tort claim process. Individuals who have been	Lacked Jurisdiction

tasked an incarcerated worker to replace the band. Person says the tort claim was denied and wants the policy changed so DOC can stop using tort claims as a loophole.

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

101. The incarcerated individual reports that the clothing policy requires individuals to tuck in their shirt when they leave the unit. The individual reports that other incarcerated individuals sexually harass her about her bottom when her shirt is tucked in. The individual says that she has been written up by DOC staff when she does not tuck in her shirt.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. Per DOC 870.400, tucking in one's shirt is part of the dress code policy at women's and men's prisons. The OCO informed the individual that she may file a PREA report if she is being sexually harassed.	No Violation of Policy
102. Patient reports continued medical concerns since transferring to a new facility. Individual reports he is in an ADA cell with no cellmate and being housed in medium when he should be in minimum. Patient requested transfer to Senior Living Unit. Staff then took away his Health Status Report (HSR) for an ADA cell and transferred him out of the facility. There was a situation where staff neglected to step in during assault and harassment, related to civil court case.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of ADA protocols by DOC. The OCO contacted health services to request review of appointments and placement assessments. DOC reports individual was seen by primary care provider and is scheduled for a follow up since transfer. Individual was not approved by DOC for the Senior Living Unit or an ADA cell. The OCO provided information about why living unit was not approved at this time and how to request a reassessment in the future. At this time, a major infraction is impacting the patient's eligibility. This case only related to the ADA portion of the concerns; staff conduct and unit concerns have been addressed in separate OCO case.	No Violation of Policy
103. A loved one of the incarcerated individual reports that he has received several infractions for not wearing a mask during video visits. The loved one also reports that he was denied a shower while he was placed in the Intensive Management Unit (IMU) following one of the infractions. The person also reports that the individual was infractioned after trying to seek medical attention and damaged the door when the facility disabled the emergency alarm system.	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
104. External person expressed concerns that their incarcerated loved one is experiencing retaliation from a DOC staff member after the incarcerated person declared a mental health emergency. Person says the staff member is trying to get the incarcerated person transferred to a different facility further away. Person says when they contacted DOC in an attempt to ask questions, they have been unable to obtain answers.	The OCO contacted health services and asked them to complete a Release of Information (ROI) in order to access mental health information. The patient declined to sign the ROI. The OCO cannot pursue further investigation without patient's consent to access their mental health records.	Person Declined OCO Involvement

**Olympic Corrections Center**

105. Incarcerated individual states that they are in segregation for an alleged sexual assault but still have not received an infraction. They want the OCO to ensure the investigation was done correctly.	The OCO reviewed the infraction and appeal packet, hearing audio and confidential informant statements and find there is evidence to substantiate the 637 infraction for committing abusive sexual contact against another incarcerated person. Multiple elements of the 637 infraction were met when the individual targeted multiple other incarcerated individuals and then had non-consensual sexual contact with them. There are multiple confidential informant statements	No Violation of Policy
---	--	------------------------

that confirm this and a PREA investigation regarding this contact was substantiated.

106. The incarcerated individual reports that he was put into the Therapeutic Community program, but his drug charges were vacated. The individual reports that he did a substance abuse assessment four years ago when he was arrived at the facility, and the DOC used this assessment to put him into the current substance abuse program.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO reviewed the individual's judgment and sentence and found that substance abuse treatment is listed as a condition. Per WAC 137-25-030, refusing to participate in an available work, training, education or other mandatory programming assignment will result in a 557 infraction. Per DOC 500.000, failure to participate in assigned programming may result in disciplinary action, loss of earned time, and/or programming points.	No Violation of Policy
---	--	------------------------

**Other - Statewide, Out of State, Jails, Community Corrections, etc.**

107. Family member expressed concerns about their loved one not having air conditioning and COVID 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
108. External person expressed concerns about the recent heat waves' impacts on people who are incarcerated and how the DOC handles measures that would help people cool down inside its facilities.	The OCO met with DOC leadership and discussed the public's concerns about the recent heat waves and the impacts on the prison population. The OCO is responding to each complaint directly from the incarcerated individuals regarding this issue and following up with each facility on a case-by-case basis.	Information Provided
109. External person expressed concerns about the recent heat waves' impacts on people who are incarcerated and how the DOC handles measures that would help people cool down inside its facilities.	The OCO met with DOC leadership and discussed the public's concerns about the recent heat waves and the impacts on the prison population. The OCO is responding to each complaint directly from the incarcerated individuals regarding this issue and following up with each facility on a case-by-case basis.	Information Provided
110. External person expressed concerns about the recent heat waves' impacts on people who are incarcerated and how the DOC handles measures that would help people cool down inside its facilities.	The OCO met with DOC leadership and discussed the public's concerns about the recent heat waves and the impacts on the prison population. The OCO is responding to each complaint directly from the incarcerated individuals regarding this issue and following up with each facility on a case-by-case basis.	Information Provided
111. External person expressed concerns about the recent heat waves' impacts on people who are incarcerated and how the DOC handles measures that would help people cool down inside its facilities.	The OCO met with DOC leadership and discussed the public's concerns about the recent heat waves and the impacts on the prison population. The OCO is responding to each complaint directly from the incarcerated individuals regarding this issue and following up with each facility on a case-by-case basis.	Information Provided
112. External person expressed concerns about the recent heat waves' impacts on people who are incarcerated and how the DOC handles measures that would help people cool down inside its facilities.	The OCO met with DOC leadership and discussed the public's concerns about the recent heat waves and the impacts on the prison population. The OCO is responding to each complaint directly from the incarcerated individuals regarding this issue and following up with each facility on a case-by-case basis.	Information Provided
113. External person expressed concerns about the recent heat waves' impacts on people who are incarcerated and how the DOC handles measures that would help people cool down inside its facilities.	The OCO met with DOC leadership and discussed the public's concerns about the recent heat waves and the impacts on the prison population. The OCO is responding to each complaint directly from the incarcerated individuals regarding this issue and following up with each facility on a case-by-case basis.	Information Provided
114. External person expressed concerns about the recent heat waves' impacts on	The OCO met with DOC leadership and discussed the public's concerns about the	Information Provided





	people who are incarcerated and how the DOC handles measures that would help people cool down inside its facilities.	recent heat waves and the impacts on the prison population. The OCO is responding to each complaint directly from the incarcerated individuals regarding this issue and following up with each facility on a case-by-case basis.	
134.	External person expressed concerns about the recent heat waves' impacts on people who are incarcerated and how the DOC handles measures that would help people cool down inside its facilities.	The OCO met with DOC leadership and discussed the public's concerns about the recent heat waves and the impacts on the prison population. The OCO is responding to each complaint directly from the incarcerated individuals regarding this issue and following up with each facility on a case-by-case basis.	Information Provided
135.	The incarcerated individual reports he was removed from Graduated Re-Entry (GRE) and returned to prison due to an administrative return. When he spoke to his counselor about the Community Parenting Alternative (CPA) program, he was told someone from classification decided he was no longer eligible for the CPA program. The individual is wondering why DOC is taking him off GRE, restricting him from programs and work release.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO determined that this person was removed from the GRE program due to housing concerns and is no longer eligible for the CPA program due to their behavior.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
136.	External person reported her loved one was in a fight and his jaw was broken. He was taken to the hospital where his jaw was wired shut. He was supposed to have the wires removed eight weeks ago and he still has the wires in his mouth. The wires have become imbedded in his gums.	This incident occurred within the Georgia Department of Corrections. The OCO lacks jurisdiction to investigate this complaint because the complaint refers to an action taken by an agency other than the Washington State Department of Corrections.	Lacked Jurisdiction
137.	Person expressed concerns about community custody officer telling them they need to get a job but they are on disability and unable to work. The person is concerned that DOC is requesting their medical records and behavioral health/counseling records and they feel this is not appropriate. Additionally, the individual is prohibited from seeing their significant other and feels discriminated against.	Per RCW 43.06C, the OCO does not have jurisdiction over community custody concerns. As a result, the concern cannot be investigated further.	Lacked Jurisdiction
138.	External person reported mistreatment of her loved one at the Chelan County Jail by correctional officers.	The OCO lacks jurisdiction to investigate this complaint because the complaint refers to an action taken by an agency other than the Washington State Department of Corrections.	Lacked Jurisdiction

### Stafford Creek Corrections Center

139.	The incarcerated individual states that he was not able to produce a sample for a urinalysis due to prostate issue. The individual was put on medication after this occurred. He received an infraction for not being able to produce a urine sample and was demoted to medium custody.	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
140.	The incarcerated individual reports that he told unit staff he was going to see medical to get his HSR removed, but then got infraacted for being out of bounds. The individual reports that he has received several infractions in his current unit, and feels his mental health is not being considered.	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
141.	The incarcerated individual reports that the facility they were transferred to has a COVID outbreak, and staff and other	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

incarcerated individuals are not following protocol by wearing PPE. The individual is concerned because they have a heart condition and do not want to get sick. The individual reports that he made a mistake asking for a transfer and would like to return to his previous facility.

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

<p>142. The incarcerated individual reports that he was brought to the Intensive Management Unit because he was infraacted for not wearing a hat properly. The individual sent certified mail and he was charged for the mail several times but it was never received. It was supposed to be sent to a superior court judge regarding power of attorney. The mail was not returned to the individual or received by the recipient. He also sent a letter to his attorney regarding attorney-client privilege and it was not received. He sent two kites to his counselor regarding this. He reports that he sent two resolution requests last week and has not received a response yet.</p>	<p>The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.</p>	<p>Administrative Remedies Not Pursued</p>
<p>143. External person reports that an incarcerated individual is being retaliated against. Person had made a complaint about DOC staff members not wearing their PPE. After the staff received write ups, they proceeded to write up the incarcerated individual five times. He was then moved out of the pod.</p>	<p>The OCO requested DOC leadership review the infractions and claims of staff misconduct. After the review, six infractions were dismissed based on violation of policy and procedure. The OCO could not substantiate retaliation against individuals based on the PPE concern reported. The OCO verified the staff member was spoken with about the PPE concerns and substantiated the staff member had written most of the infractions prior to that date.</p>	<p>Assistance Provided</p>
<p>144. External complainant reports patient has clogged blood vessels and needs to see a specialist. He is being denied surgery because he is not ambulatory and is confined to a wheelchair. He has been requesting offsite physical therapy for years to learn how to walk again after losing his other leg while incarcerated.</p>	<p>The OCO contacted DOC medical to request they review this issue and follow up with a vascular specialist as medically indicated. The OCO confirmed that DOC scheduled the patient with a vascular surgery specialist and later followed up to ensure the appointment had occurred. The patient's diagnosis and treatment plan were updated and medication was prescribed; surgery not medically indicated. Patient contacted the OCO to report that he received the appointment and treatment. (There is a separate case regarding the physical therapy concerns, submitted by the patient.)</p>	<p>Assistance Provided</p>
<p>145. Multiple incarcerated individuals have reported excessive infractions in the Veteran's Pod.</p>	<p>Upon receipt of these concerns, the OCO communicated directly with SCCC leadership about the matter, toured the unit and independently reviewed infraction data. After speaking with unit staff and the incarcerated population, the OCO requested SCCC leadership investigate this allegation. SCCC leadership agreed to open an investigation to include an audit of the infractions. The OCO and the DOC substantiated that the individuals in the Veteran's Pod were served infractions after the COVID-19 outbreak rather than immediately following an alleged incident, as required in DOC 460.000. Because of the substantiated policy and procedure violations, SCCC Leadership agreed to dismiss two infractions for this individual.</p>	<p>Assistance Provided</p>
<p>146. The incarcerated individual reports that she only has two pairs of underwear</p>	<p>The OCO provided assistance. This office contacted the facility and requested that the</p>	<p>Assistance Provided</p>



after five pairs were lost in the laundry. She filled out a lost laundry form several times, but it never got to the right person and she has had to wash her underwear in the shower for two months.

individual be given the five pairs of underwear that were lost. DOC staff confirmed the next day that the individual's missing underwear were replaced and given to her.

<p>147. Incarcerated individual reported that they need a wet cell due to their medical condition. This person is being transferred, and there are not wet cells in long-term minimum. Staff have told them that there are wet cells elsewhere, but it will take a while for them to be transferred to that area. The facility has tried to transfer him twice and he has refused to move. The second time he was infraacted for doing so.</p>	<p>The OCO contacted the facility to verify if he could be placed in a long-term minimum wet cell. The OCO confirmed there is a unit with wet cells at the other facility. However, the transfer has been halted while DOC conducts a new review of placement.</p>	<p>Assistance Provided</p>
<p>148. Patient states his implanted medical device is not working correctly and is causing pain. He has not been able to see a specialist to have the settings adjusted.</p>	<p>The OCO provided assistance. The OCO contacted the Patient Care Navigator and Health Services management to discuss the plan of care. This office was informed the patient was able to attend the neurosurgeon's appointment and was referred to a different specialist. DOC is working to get the patient an appointment with the outside clinic. There are significant delays caused by the outside clinic's availability that have affected care access for several patients.</p>	<p>Assistance Provided</p>
<p>149. The incarcerated individual is reporting possible staff misconduct and infractions. The infractions are excessive and direct result from a staff reprimand for not wearing PPE. 9 out of 12 Black men in his unit received infractions. As a result of the infractions, he was moved out of the unit. He appealed the infraction.</p>	<p>The OCO requested DOC leadership review the infractions and claims of staff misconduct. After the review, four infractions were dismissed based on violation of policy and procedure. The OCO could not substantiate retaliation against individuals based on the PPE concern reported. The OCO verified the staff member was spoken with about the PPE concerns and substantiated the staff member had written most of the infractions prior to that date. In addition, the OCO verified the number of Black individuals who received an infraction was lower than what was reported in the concern.</p>	<p>Assistance Provided</p>
<p>150. Multiple incarcerated individuals have reported excessive infractions in the Veteran's Pod.</p>	<p>Upon receipt of these concerns, the OCO communicated directly with SCCC leadership about the matter, toured the Unit and independently reviewed infraction data. After speaking with unit staff and the incarcerated population, the OCO requested SCCC leadership investigate this allegation. SCCC leadership agreed to open an investigation to include an audit of the infractions. The OCO and the DOC substantiated that the individuals in the Veteran's Pod were served infractions after the COVID-19 outbreak rather than immediately following an alleged incident, as required in DOC 460.000. Because of the substantiated policy and procedure violations, SCCC Leadership agreed to dismiss four infractions for this individual.</p>	<p>Assistance Provided</p>
<p>151. The incarcerated individual is concerned about staff misconduct. Individuals in the unit are receiving excessive infractions after a staff member was reprimanded for not wearing PPE. He appealed the infractions and they were upheld.</p>	<p>The OCO requested DOC leadership review the infractions and claims of staff misconduct. After the review, two infractions were dismissed based on violation of policy and procedure. The OCO could not substantiate retaliation against individuals based on the PPE concern reported. The OCO verified the staff member was spoken with about the PPE concerns and substantiated the staff member</p>	<p>Assistance Provided</p>

had written most of the infractions prior to that date.

152.	Incarcerated individual reports he is being moved out of the Veteran's unit on grounds that he has not complied with his agreement to be housed there. He has not done anything from the signed contract that would qualify as non-compliance and believes that he is being targeted for his crime by being removed from this unit and fears for his safety in other units.	The OCO requested DOC leadership review the infractions and claims of staff misconduct. After the review, seven infractions were dismissed based on violation of policy and procedure. The OCO could not substantiate the individual's allegation of staff targeting him.	Assistance Provided
153.	Incarcerated individual reports he filed a public records request with DOC and DOC failed to provide him with all of the documentation he requested. He knows that he was not provided everything because he requested kiosk messages between him and a DOC staff member and was not disclosed the kiosk messages. The individual wrote to the DOC public records unit explaining the issue and requesting the records request be reviewed. DOC then told him that the records did not exist after re-opening the request.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO spoke with DOC public records staff who reviewed the public records request and explained that their department should have clarified the request to understand it further. DOC staff agreed to reach out to the individual and request clarification to provide him with his full request.	Assistance Provided
154.	Multiple incarcerated individuals have reported excessive infractions in the Veteran's Pod.	Upon receipt of these concerns, the OCO communicated directly with SCCC leadership about the matter, toured the Veteran's Unit and independently reviewed infraction data. After speaking with unit staff and the incarcerated population, the OCO requested SCCC leadership investigate this allegation. SCCC leadership agreed to open an investigation to include an audit of the infractions. The OCO and the DOC substantiated that the individuals in the Veteran's Pod were served infractions after the COVID-19 outbreak rather than immediately following an alleged incident, as required in DOC 460.000. Because of the substantiated policy and procedure violations, SCCC leadership agreed to dismiss six infractions for this individual.	Assistance Provided
155.	Incarcerated individual reports Stafford Creek Corrections Center (SCCC) resolution department has lost his resolution requests and will not allow him to appeal them to level three, saying the resolution requests are still being investigated at level two. The individual received an initial DOC resolution request response in January and was told the COVID-19 outbreak delayed the first appeal. He is concerned DOC could have his resolution requests mixed up, as he has filed multiple since the first one.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The individual's resolution request was responded to and DOC sorted out any potential issue of the resolution requests being mixed up. The individual was given the opportunity to appeal the resolution request to the next level once the level two investigation was complete.	DOC Resolved
156.	The incarcerated individual reports that his unit was put on limited outbreak status. The individuals in the unit were given two PCR tests and all were negative. The individuals in the unit were told they would need to take a third PCR test before quarantine can be lifted, and the individual is frustrated that he has not been able to work during this time. The individual reports that quarantine should have been lifted after two PCR tests per protocol.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. Quarantine was lifted in the incarcerated individual's unit shortly after the complaint was submitted to this office.	DOC Resolved

157.	Person states that a surgeon broke internal hardware and he has been denied a second opinion on whether the hardware can be removed. He states he has pain every time he moves.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The patient has been seen by the outside specialist and the treatment will be scheduled according to surgeon's recommendations.	DOC Resolved
158.	Loved one of an incarcerated individual reports that DOC staff have not been forthcoming about the Tuberculosis (TB) outbreak at the facility. The loved one requests that DOC provide more transparent communication about the status of the outbreak and wants DOC to research better ways to mitigate spread of TB within the facility.	The OCO provided information regarding the current efforts DOC is making to contain the Tuberculosis outbreak. The DOC is working with the Department of Health and the Centers for Disease Control to implement mitigation strategies. The DOC is providing as much information as possible to the population and community without risking the identification of individuals' health statuses.	Information Provided
159.	Incarcerated individual called to report a named DOC staff member was enforcing cohorted day room schedules. Individual is housed in the Skill Builders Unit. No other units are being cohorted; DOC is allowing people to shelter in place, so the individual does not understand why they are having to cohort. The individual reports a DOC staff member is yelling at the individuals trying to get a reaction out of them, or she may be stressed because of COVID-19 returning; he was not sure.	The OCO provided information regarding the cohorting schedule at the time this concern was reported to OCO. Stafford Creek Corrections Center (SCCC) was on facility-wide outbreak status at the time this complaint was received and the cohort schedule his unit was adhering to was correct per DOC COVID-19 response protocol. The OCO provided information about how to report issues with staff as they arise because the staff conduct had not been reported to DOC.	Information Provided
160.	External person reports their incarcerated loved one has tried to call the OCO the last two Tuesdays but DOC has refused him access to these calls.	The OCO provided information to the external person. The OCO hotline was temporarily closed from July 18, 2022, to August 1, 2022, due to staff capacity. All incarcerated individuals received a kiosk message from the OCO on July 13, 2022, regarding the hotline closure.	Information Provided
161.	Incarcerated individual reports he should be getting 100 days of Good Conduct Time (GCT) every six months due to a DOC crafted GCT restoration plan. However, DOC is only giving him 83 days of GCT every six months, and this has happened three times so far.	The OCO provided detailed information regarding the reasons he was not getting 100 days back every six months. The OCO reviewed the individual's Good Conduct Time (GCT) restoration plan and spoke with DOC records staff about the concern. The OCO found DOC is correctly restoring the good conduct time (GCT). GCT cannot be restored day for day when a person is serving time for multiple causes because DOC needs to correctly restore the time onto each cause number. This results in the actual days afforded to the individual's ERD being 83 days, not 100 days. The OCO provided a detailed breakdown of the time calculation including the GCT restoration credits to provide clarity to the individual about why the GCT restoration is not day for day.	Information Provided
162.	Incarcerated individual wanted to report a concern but is afraid of retaliation so reported anonymously. There is an officer in his unit who doesn't wear a mask. No one in the pod is encouraged to wear a mask.	The OCO contacted the Superintendent regarding this concern. The video of the pod was pulled and reviewed at the time identified in the anonymous complaint. After review, the OCO could not substantiate that the employee was not wearing a mask.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
163.	The incarcerated individual reports legal access for people housed in the Intensive Management Unit (IMU) occurs between 12am and 2am and he requests the Law Library schedule be changed to a more reasonable time.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. DOC provided the OCO with Stafford Creek Corrections Center (SCCC) Intensive Management Unit (IMU) legal access schedule which is 6:00pm to 9:00pm on Tuesday, Thursday and Saturday for third shift. Legal access is available seven days a week on first shift.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate

164. The incarcerated person reports DOC is trying to move him back into his cell with a roommate who has not had COVID while he is experiencing severe COVID symptoms. DOC told him they have no record of him having COVID, but he has symptoms. Staff tested him three more times because they lost the tests.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO found DOC did recognize that the individual had COVID-19 and he elected to isolate in another area of the facility. The individual has been cleared by medical to return to the unit as recovered from COVID-19.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
165. Incarcerated individual reports moving facilities and getting into an argument with another individual which resulted in them going to segregation. Based on this and several behavioral observation entries (BOE) the individual was infraacted for strong-arming as the individual says DOC staff told them they were stopping people from going to the chapel.	The OCO reviewed what materials were available for this infraction, but this infraction was over five years old and limited records still exist for it. Without the complete records packet for the infraction, which often includes photos, videos, confidential statements and an extensive infraction and appeal packet, the OCO was unable to substantiate the concern.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
166. External person shared concerns about the safety of an incarcerated individual. Person reports the incarcerated individual was moved and assigned an upper bunk although he has a Health Status Report for a lower bunk. Person also says the incarcerated person is housed with a gang member who is trying to get him moved and there is an open cell with a lower bunk available, however the staff member the incarcerated person spoke with told him he was not allowed to move anyone for thirty days.	The OCO identified the incarcerated individual listed in this concern. The incarcerated individual shared that he did not make any complaints about his housing assignment, he gets along with his cell mate, he does not have an HSR for a lower bunk, and he declined a move to another cell.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
167. Person says that their issue concerning medical/optometry not writing him a prescription for the correct vision for glasses has not been resolved. Person says their glasses are not the correct vision lens.	The Office of the Corrections Ombuds has reviewed all optometry appointments for this individual. He has had multiple eye exams, and a licensed provider screened his vision. The individual does not currently qualify under DOC policy for prescription glasses. Their other option would be to see an outside provider utilizing the Offender Paid Health Care Plan. The individual can continue to have his vision checked yearly to reassess his needs, and if there is a change in vision, the provider will discuss the next steps. This office cannot substantiate that he was denied treatment or that DOC violated policy.	No Violation of Policy
168. Incarcerated individual reports DOC denied him access to Graduated Re-Entry (GRE) without reason. The individual has not been infraacted recently and believes he should be eligible for GRE.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. Per DOC 350.300 Mutual Re-Entry Program (MRP), "The department has established a reentry planning process for individuals committed for Murder 1, continuously confined for 10 years or more, or otherwise identified as needing a more structured transition to lower levels of custody." The individual did not want to participate in mutual re-entry programming which deems him ineligible for GRE at this time as he meets the requirements for mutual re-entry programming.	No Violation of Policy
169. Incarcerated individual has been told that they are going to be transferred. Individual states that they have limited mobility and need an ADA cell and should not be placed in a facility that places them on mainline. They are concerned about security threat groups (STG) threats that could result in serious injury. They believe the move is	The OCO was able to determine there is no violation of DOC policy. The individual was advised that they will be transferred to a facility that can accommodate their needs while in the appropriate custody level. Their plan was reviewed by the ADA coordinator, medical, and mental health.	No Violation of Policy

retaliation and that it will place them in immediate danger.

<p>170. Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about an infraction that included an infraction for possessing any tattoo paraphernalia (710), an infraction for receiving a positive test for drugs (752) and an infraction for damaging property to conceal contraband (893)9). They state DOC staff did not leave a search report after the items were taken and the unit area logbook was not filled out to document the search. The individual also reports they were denied witness statements.</p>	<p>The OCO reviewed the infraction and appeal packet as well as the hearing audio and found no violation of DOC policy. There is evidence to substantiate all three of the infractions and the staff member who conducted the search mailed the search report to the individual the next day. Additionally, one witness statement was denied due to duplicative reasons which allowable per policy.</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy</p>
<p>171. The incarcerated individual received a 557 infraction for refusing to attend chemical dependency group treatment. The individual reports that there is nothing in his judgment and sentence that requires chemical dependency treatment. The infraction was not given because there was a judgement and sentence, but because he refused to do what DOC staff told him to do. The reason he would not attend is due to his fear of exposure to COVID-19 after having it in the past.</p>	<p>The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO reviewed the individual's judgment and sentence and found that substance abuse treatment is listed under conditions. Per WAC 137-25-030, refusing to participate in an available work, training, education or other mandatory programming assignment will result in a 557 infraction. Per DOC 500.000, failure to participate in assigned programming may result in disciplinary action, loss of earned time, and/or programming points.</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy</p>
<p>172. The incarcerated individual has been trying to get a new pair of shoes for four months.</p>	<p>This person was released prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The individual had contacted this office three days prior to their release.</p>	<p>Person Left DOC Custody Prior to OCO Action</p>
<p>173. The incarcerated individual reports that his resolution requests are not being answered within program timeframes.</p>	<p>The OCO was able to substantiate this concern, but was not able to achieve a resolution. The OCO was able to substantiate the resolution program had not responded to his resolution requests within the timeframes outlined in the DOC Resolution Program Manual. The OCO spoke with DOC resolution staff and the staff member confirmed that the resolution request was past due. The resolution department had a backlog of resolution requests due to staffing issues and multiple medical outbreaks at the facility.</p>	<p>Substantiated Without Resolution</p>

### Washington Corrections Center

<p>174. The incarcerated individual reports they have been on quarantine for nearly forty days since they arrived at the facility and have not had access to a full hour in the yard, kiosk, non-recorded phones for attorney calls, or the law library. The person reports they have tested negative for COVID-19 every time but have not seen a movement or spoken with their counselor for almost two months.</p>	<p>The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.</p>	<p>Administrative Remedies Not Pursued</p>
<p>175. Incarcerated individual is disputing the response from the Resolutions Coordinator. The individual reports that the Resolutions Coordinator changed the narrative of the incident to support the staff member. The individual believes this was done in a retaliation. The individual reports that the resolution that he suggested was then suggested in the DOC's response to him.</p>	<p>The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.</p>	<p>Administrative Remedies Not Pursued</p>

176. Incarcerated individual reports they need access to legal property but DOC is not responding. They state they have an approaching legal deadline and need these items.	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
177. Incarcerated person was transferred to another facility and has been waiting for approximately a month to receive his property. Person needs access to the legal documents that are in his boxes.	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
178. The incarcerated person reports that he is currently incarcerated on a DOSA revoke but has six points from <i>State vs. Blake</i> cases that need to be vacated from his record. The person says the facility is not allowing anyone access to the law library at this time because of staff shortages and the facility's restricted movement status.	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
179. The incarcerated individual reports that he was denied access to the law library upon arrival at the receiving facility, which caused him to miss a deadline to file an appeal with the court. The individual reports that DOC staff stated they could not provide access to the law library due to quarantine and that they never received the request for legal materials from him, despite his numerous attempts to communicate the requests.	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
180. Incarcerated individual reports two books were ordered for them through Amazon and received by an employee in the mailroom. However, he did not receive the books. Individual reports having trouble grieving this concern and he cannot access Amazon directly.	The OCO reviewed the concern because the individual was not successful in resolving the issue through the resolution department. DOC reports to OCO that the mailroom does not have record of receiving the books. The OCO provided information regarding how to facilitate a refund from Amazon. The OCO requested the tracking numbers of the packages in order to investigate further.	Information Provided
181. Person says DOC staff did not follow protocol when he had to call a medical emergency for an infection. Patient states that he had to wait more than two hours on the unit to be sent to medical.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO contacted DOC Health Services management and reviewed the available emergency response documentation. There was no custody documentation to confirm when the patient declared a medical emergency on the unit. Individuals who have been harmed or who have suffered a loss as a result of negligent actions by a state employee or agency can submit a tort claim to the Office of Risk Management (ORM). ORM is required by law (RCW Chapter 4.92) to receive these claims.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
182. The incarcerated individual is trying to appeal their DOC sentence, stating that they are not guilty of the absconding charge or the new charges that followed as a result. The individual says they were under the care of a doctor and had a doctor's note, but could not produce the note while incarcerated.	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
183. External person reported 19 people were removed from a unit when they tested	Individuals in facilities statewide are moved if they test positive for COVID-19. The DOC	No Violation of Policy

positive for COVID-19. Person reports that incarcerated individuals are not swabbing themselves correctly for fear of testing positive and being moved. The external person says they know funding is given for positive cases and the worry is that the facility is falsely creating positive results in order to secure their funding.

implemented these policies to address COVID-19 conditions within the facilities. The OCO could not determine that the DOC actions were outside of the DOC policies in this case. This office also could not find sufficient evidence to substantiate that incarcerated individuals are faking their COVID-19 nose swabs or that the DOC purposefully allows this to happen for more funding.

<p>184. Incarcerated person reports that before being transferred to another facility they were given a COVID-19 test and then given another one upon arrival at the new facility. Person says both tests came back negative for the virus, however, they were housed in a quarantined unit although they were under the impression they would just be housed there overnight, this put the person's life in jeopardy.</p>	<p>All facilities do a separation upon intake, regardless of a negative test. This is not a violation of DOC policy for the individual to be placed in a separated area.</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy</p>
<p>185. Incarcerated person has been trying to get back on their mental health medications since arriving at the receiving facility five weeks ago and DOC has not responded to his requests.</p>	<p>The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. Per DOC 610.040: a psychiatric assessment should be completed within 60 days of arrival when an individual is on at least one psychotropic medication. The OCO's review determined that the individual is on the list for evaluation and that DOC was unable to verify an existing prescription.</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy</p>

**Washington Corrections Center for Women**

<p>186. Incarcerated individual feels like they are being targeted and treated poorly and that DOC did not handle the incident well. They asked the staff member if they could wear gloves to do the mouth sweeps and asked that DOC provide them but was denied this request. The person was then infraacted for this as they wanted to use the gloves but did not actively refuse. The sergeant also used the incorrect pronouns and the person was trying to explain this when they were ordered to cell-in.</p>	<p>The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.</p>	<p>Administrative Remedies Not Pursued</p>
<p>187. Incarcerated individual states Jpay is not giving the two free visits each week, instead it is making family members pay for this month or go to the following month.</p>	<p>The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.</p>	<p>Administrative Remedies Not Pursued</p>
<p>188. Incarcerated individual reports missing an appointment with her provider while in isolation following a hospital stay. She still has not had a follow up appointment. She went to sick call and was not seen by anyone. She finally saw a provider who told her that she cannot help her because she is under care of another provider and only provided Tylenol and ibuprofen. She would like a new doctor because she feels she is being neglected by the providers she has seen. She has sent kites and has not received any useful appointments with a provider or information about what she should do. She has filed grievances about the pain and wanting a new doctor. Staff keep telling her that she missed the</p>	<p>The OCO contacted DOC health services and substantiated the patient was not taken to multiple medical appointments while on isolation status and those appointments were rescheduled. Medical agreed to contact the patient and schedule her sooner than the rescheduled appointment. The OCO communicated with DOC to ensure that the patient received her appointment. The patient was seen for follow up assessment related to her hospitalization and prescribed pain medication for chronic pain management. Her diagnoses were updated and additional follow up was scheduled.</p>	<p>Assistance Provided</p>

appointment but she could not go because she was in isolation.

<p>189. Incarcerated person reports when she filed a resolution request to address a staff member's behavior that made her feel threatened and antagonized, the response from the Resolution Specialist was that the Resolution Program no longer handles staff conduct complaints and that by filing the request the incarcerated individual is using the program to make a threat to the officer. Person is wondering how they would file complaints regarding staff misconduct if not for the Resolution Program.</p>	<p>The OCO reviewed the Resolution Request Handbook. This office verified actions of department employees, contract staff, or volunteers are still considered accepted concerns. The OCO contacted the facility leadership and requested that the resolution request be reviewed and assigned. The DOC agreed and this resolution request will be re-processed.</p>	<p>Assistance Provided</p>
<p>190. The incarcerated individual has chronic fibromyalgia, and the DOC wants her to work in the kitchen. The individual does not feel like it is an appropriate employment position because of her medical disabilities. The individual also reports that officers are entering the COVID-19 isolation unit and not changing their proper protective equipment (PPE) before stepping into the non-COVID unit.</p>	<p>The OCO provided information regarding the next steps this person needs to take with the medical department to get a different employment position. The OCO also contacted the DOC about staff members not changing their PPE in between units.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>191. The incarcerated person was moved to segregation without an explanation. Almost a week later, she received the segregation paperwork and was told that the investigation staff would talk to her. It has been almost a month, and no one has come to speak with her.</p>	<p>The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO determined that there is an ongoing investigation regarding this person and this facility is currently on outbreak status, which will slow down the investigation process. This person can be held in Administrative Segregation for up to 30 days and possibly longer with an extension, per policy 320.200.</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy</p>
<p>192. Incarcerated person reports concerns with how the facility is handling COVID-19 operations.</p>	<p>The OCO was unable to determine the complaint involved a DOC action upon which an OCO investigation could be based. The DOC implemented policies to address COVID-19 conditions within the facilities. The OCO was not able to determine the DOC actions in this case were outside of the DOC policies.</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy</p>
<p>193. The incarcerated individual reports that she was taken to segregation two weeks ago. The only paperwork she received said she was being moved for a "confidential investigation/covid 19". She wants to find out what is going on and to be able to go back to her unit/her room.</p>	<p>The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. Per DOC 320.200, an individual may be assigned to Ad Seg when the individual is pending investigation.</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy</p>
<p>194. External complainant reports her loved one has not been receiving the medications she should have. Her provider has not seen her since she went from jail to WCCW. The provider says the individual does not need the medications which include heart medications and pain medications and indicated that the patient will feel better when she's off of the all the medications. A provider she saw before she was incarcerated expressed concern about possible history of strokes or multiple sclerosis. To address the patient's pain, the complainant wants DOC to issue a Health Status Report (HSR) for a blue mat or even ice packs. Person feels patient needs medications for her heart and more exams to figure out all of the</p>	<p>The OCO contacted health services to request they review the patient's medical care and medications. Medications were adjusted at WCCW according to DOC Benzo/Opioid Protocols; patient was assessed and diagnosis and treatment plan updated. DOC could not identify current symptoms or diagnosis of MS and has access to patient's records and history. Patient is being assessed for ice pack HSR, although typically only issued for acute injuries, and is scheduled for additional follow up. Ice is available in the unit, and DOC health services confirmed with custody that everyone in the unit can access ice except during cease movements or recalls. Patient is receiving appointments, follow up is scheduled, and has an active treatment plan aligned with the DOC Health Plan and DOC formulary medications.</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy</p>



medical concerns. The providers are refusing to see her despite her multiple documented medical issues. She received the necessary medical care in jail but is having many issues since being in prison.

<p>195. The incarcerated individual was placed in segregation pending an investigation. They report that they have no personal property and have been told by multiple DOC staff the investigator is going to come to talk to them.</p>	<p>The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO determined that there is an ongoing investigation regarding this person and this facility is currently on COVID outbreak status, which will slow the investigation process. An incarcerated individual can be held in Administrative Segregation for up to 30 days and possibly longer with an extension. This information can be found in policy 320.200.</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy</p>
<p>196. The incarcerated individual reports that she was initially placed in segregation under investigation for threatening someone. She was cleared to go back to her unit but was moved to receiving instead and placed under investigation with three others. The investigation staff have not talked with her, and she does not know why she is under investigation.</p>	<p>This person was released prior to the OCO taking action on the complaint.</p>	<p>Person Left DOC Custody Prior to OCO Action</p>
<p>197. Incarcerated person reports that the tap water is not sanitary. They report that the water is causing them pain in their teeth, head, and liver. They would like to have filtered water to drink and use for brushing their teeth and washing their face.</p>	<p>The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.</p>	<p>Administrative Remedies Not Pursued</p>
<p>198. Incarcerated person reports that their civil rights are being violated by not allowing them access to the law library or the proper legal forms. Person is working on a lawsuit and says that DOC is intentionally keeping them from adding their name to the bill of rights. Person is challenging the legality of the Persistent Offenders Accountability Act.</p>	<p>The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.</p>	<p>Administrative Remedies Not Pursued</p>
<p>199. Incarcerated individual states that DOC staff asked them to leave work as staff states they saw the individual trying to sneak up on a staff member on the camera. The individual is worried that they will be infracted and reports that they did not try to sneak up on a staff. Individual reports that days before this incident, other incarcerated individuals were telling them to be cautious around this staff member because they are known to be racist.</p>	<p>The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.</p>	<p>Administrative Remedies Not Pursued</p>
<p>200. The incarcerated individual reports that DOC staff searched their cell and did not follow policy. Staff did not give them the itemized search report for over an hour after the cell search was performed. During the search, staff destroyed a religious picture that the individual had been drawing for several months.</p>	<p>The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.</p>	<p>Administrative Remedies Not Pursued</p>
<p>201. Family member states their loved one was infracted for refusing to submit to a urinalysis but this was because the individual had just used the restroom and could not provide another sample. The reason this person was to provide a sample was because they were given a</p>	<p>The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.</p>	<p>Administrative Remedies Not Pursued</p>

test a few days prior but the staff member forgot to record the results. The individual was also infracted for refusing to return to their unit after they had been threatened.

202.	Incarcerated individual has three dental problems that need to be addressed which are causing serious pain to eat and sleep. The person has kited and grieved dental multiple times and needs to have their off-site dental appointments addressed.	The OCO provided assistance; the office contacted DOC health services and received confirmation that the off-site dental appointment with a specialist is scheduled within the next week.	Assistance Provided
203.	The patient reports he is concerned about meeting with DOC medical and mental health staff after medical injected him with the wrong medication before he transferred to his current facility. He is concerned about multiple mental health and medical issues but is afraid to meet with medical.	The OCO contacted the facility medical and healthcare team and continued discussions about re-engaging and building trust with the patient at the new facility. DOC confirmed medical and mental health appointments and followed up with the patient and OCO after encounters. Patient has agreed to monthly mental health meetings after previously refusing treatment. Patient continues to express concerns with engaging medical staff. This office provided the patient with information about options for following up with medical should he choose to.	Assistance Provided
204.	Incarcerated individual was screened for a single cell and was denied due to not meeting criteria. The incarcerated individual claims that he should qualify based on past assaults.	The OCO reviewed his single cell screening and history of PREA and assault. After the review the OCO contacted DOC Headquarters and asked if the incarcerated individual could be re-screened. The DOC agreed to submit a re-screening. The DOC will notify him with the results.	Assistance Provided
205.	The patient has been in IMU for six months. Person reports that on multiple incidents staff did not respond to his emergencies appropriately. Person reports that DOC staff wait until the crisis is over before doing anything. Person states that they do not feel safe in the IMU.	DOC staff initially resolved this concern; subsequent review by the OCO revealed the need for additional follow up after the patient had been moved back to the IMU. The OCO requested review of the situation. The patient has been transferred to the medical living unit. Long term housing options are being further reviewed by DOC.	Assistance Provided
206.	The incarcerated individual is nearing his Earned Release Date (ERD) and reports that his counselor has not attempted to get his address approved. The individual says that he has a 35-day notification requirement and DOC staff have told him they cannot approve of the address until 30 days before his release date.	The OCO provided assistance and found out why the individual's Release Plan (ORP) was not approved. This office contacted the individual's counselor and discussed his ORP and what steps would be taken to ensure the individual releases on time, which he did.	Assistance Provided
207.	The incarcerated individual reports that he is being transferred to a new facility and has safety concerns. The individual reports that there are other incarcerated individuals at the facility who have threatened to harm him.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO's review determined that the incarcerated individual had active keep separates at the facility. OCO staff spoke with the individual's counselor and the Correctional Unit Supervisor (CUS) regarding safety concerns. The OCO then met by phone with the individual to discuss his safety concerns. The individual reported that he no longer has these concerns, as he is separated from the individuals he feared would harm him.	Assistance Provided
208.	Family member expressed concerns about incarcerated individual being in the intensive management unit (IMU) for seven months as this isolation is negatively impacting them.	The DOC resolved this concern before the OCO began the investigation as the individual had been transferred and removed from intensive management unit (IMU) when OCO began the investigation.	DOC Resolved
209.	Family reports patient has filed a grievance about medical attention for ongoing stomach issues. He received an appointment last year, an ultrasound,	DOC resolved the concern prior to OCO outreach. The OCO contacted health services; DOC reports patient received appointment and	DOC Resolved

	and medication that is not improving his condition. Family received a message from the patient saying he cannot eat. He has attempted to get an appointment but medical is ignoring his requests.	has an active treatment plan including follow up once the results are available.	
210.	Person states that DOC has lied several times about him being seen by a provider for his back pain. Has been told by medical he does not qualify for durable medical equipment that could mitigate pain.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The patient has been moved to another provider's caseload and has received the requested equipment. Person was also informed individuals who have been harmed or who have suffered a loss as a result of negligent actions by a state employee or agency can submit a tort claim to the Office of Risk Management (ORM). ORM is required by law (RCW Chapter 4.92) to receive these claims. This person expressed new concerns during the investigation that was submitted as a new case with OCO.	DOC Resolved
211.	This person reports that he has been in Administrative Segregation for over two months, and he wants to know when he is getting out. This person reports that he should be going to work release soon.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO determined that person was moved to another facility and is no longer in Administrative Segregation.	DOC Resolved
212.	Patient reports continued concern about not being seen by neurology since 2020 despite continued breakthrough seizures and diagnosis of lesion on optic nerve. Patient expressed concerns about red flags for serious disease and has not been diagnosed. He said he has severe neurological problems and cannot get pain medication, only over-the-counter remedies. Patient reports that DOC lied to the OCO during last case when they told this office that he had been treated. Patient concerned he is still having medical appointments cancelled.	This case was reactivated by the OCO upon receiving an updated complaint from the patient. The OCO's second review found that a medical transfer was approved as part of custody facility plan and there is not yet a date indicated. The OCO confirmed the patient is scheduled to see a neurologist by the end of the year per specialist recommendations, and a neurosurgery consult this month that was rescheduled due to the provider being out of office. Records indicate patient has been seen multiple times by DOC medical since transferring facilities. The OCO cannot expedite offsite appointment dates. DOC resolved this concern prior to OCO outreach by rescheduling the patient after offsite cancellation and approving a medical transfer.	DOC Resolved
213.	External person is concerned OCO is not receiving mail for their incarcerated loved one.	The OCO's review showed that this office has received this individual's mail. This office sent the external person an acknowledgment letter that explains next steps.	Information Provided
214.	External person expressed concerns about the recent heat waves' impacts on people who are incarcerated and how the DOC handles measures that would help people cool down inside its facilities.	The OCO met with DOC leadership and discussed the public's concerns about the recent heat waves and the impacts on the prison population. The OCO is responding to each complaint directly from the incarcerated individuals regarding this issue and following up with each facility on a case-by-case basis.	Information Provided
215.	A loved one of the incarcerated individual reports that the individual transferred facilities for his upcoming release. The loved one reports that the individual was told that their tv was broken, and they also report that money they sent to their loved one has not been added to his account.	The OCO provided information regarding when the incarcerated individual's funds were transferred to his current facility. This office also provided information regarding how the individual can file a Tort Claim if his property has been damaged.	Information Provided
216.	Incarcerated person reports that the rights of a named STG group are being violated by the DOC. Person says that people associated with this group are being promoted to lower custody levels but are not being transferred out to their destination facility, and the custody	This group is listed as a Security Threat Group and per RCW 72.09.745 the department may collect, evaluate, and analyze data and specific investigative and intelligence information concerning the existence, structure, activities, and operations of security threat groups and the participants involved therein under the	Information Provided

promotions and demotions are not being submitted per Plan Change Review nor is the department upholding the 90 day hold date.

jurisdiction of the department. The data compiled may aid in addressing violence reduction, illegal activities, and identification of separation or protection needs, and may be used to assist law enforcement agencies and prosecutors in developing evidence for purposes of criminal prosecution upon request. The OCO advised the individual that if they are personally impacted by a classification plan, they can appeal the plan.

<p>217. External person expressed concerns that the most up-to-date and accurate Local Family Council information has not been made available to incarcerated individuals in the living units at the facility. Person also raised concerns regarding the funds allocated from the Incarcerated Individual's Betterment Fund to the Law Library was not spent. Person further interacted concerns about the mask and testing procedures in place at visitation and the questions the need to continues such protocols when the virus has likely become endemic.</p>	<p>The OCO provided information to the external person regarding the multiple issues they reported. The OCO recommended they contact the Department of Corrections regarding the IIBF and follow up with their local family representative to advise them that the local family council information is unavailable in the facility. The OCO advised that they can also contact the Superintendent at the facility. Mask mandates are still in place in congregate settings, which is an order of the Governor and is not a decision made by the DOC.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>218. Incarcerated individual reports he is having issues accessing programming within DOC. The individual reports he has requested placement into programming but DOC staff are telling him he does not qualify for programming at this time. He would like to access programming while incarcerated.</p>	<p>The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO reviewed the individuals central file and found that the individual has not had access to programming because he has been housed mostly in the Intensive Management Unit (IMU) since he entered prison for personal protection. DOC has moved the individual to a safe harbor unit, where he will be able to access programming. The OCO also reviewed the safety concerns the individual reported to DOC and found DOC investigated and responded to the concerns appropriately by finding another housing option for the individual.</p>	<p>Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate</p>
<p>219. Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about an infraction and the delay that DOC took in responding to their appeal as well as other procedural concerns.</p>	<p>The incarcerated individual pled guilty to this infraction and per DOC Policy 460.000(G)(1)(A), an incarcerated individual cannot appeal a finding of guilt when they have pled guilty to the violation, and per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO requires infractions be appealed before they can be investigated. As a result, the OCO is unable to investigate this infraction concern.</p>	<p>Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate</p>
<p>220. Incarcerated individual reports DOC staff used excessive force when he placed his hand out of the cuff port. The individual reports he was trying to use the cuff port to brace himself and DOC staff pinned his hand in the cuff port. The individual reports being harmed during the incident.</p>	<p>The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO reviewed all pertinent documentation including video and the use of force packet. The OCO was unable to identify evidence to support DOC used force in violation of DOC 410.200 Use of Force. The handheld camcorder was not working at the time of this use of force. The individual's medical care concerns were reviewed by OCO staff in a separate investigation.</p>	<p>Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate</p>
<p>221. Incarcerated person alleges DOC violated several WAC codes during the disciplinary hearings process. Person states that they were denied rights as stated in WAC codes and staff did not follow proper procedure when writing the infractions.</p>	<p>The OCO reviewed the infraction and appeal packet and hearing audio and find there is evidence to substantiate all three infractions. Regarding the concerns about procedural issues including the duration of the continuances, DOC policy states that timeframes are nonjurisdictional and failure to abide by them is not grounds for the dismissal of an infraction. The OCO was unable to substantiate that their witness statements</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy</p>

were denied; the hearings officer forwarded the two questions to the appropriate officers, and they responded. There were also several other witness statements requested by the incarcerated person that were read onto the record during the hearing audio.

<p>222. Incarcerated person reports they were issued an infraction, however, the person states that the infraction was wrongfully written as staff used allegations, opinions, and belief statements, not factual arguments which does not follow the directives on how to write an infraction. Person also says what they were infraacted for does not fit the definition as outlined in WAC 137-25-030(5).</p>	<p>The OCO reviewed the infraction and appeal packet, hearing audio, the rejected letter itself and photos comparing the handwriting of the letter to that of the incarcerated individual. There is evidence to substantiate the 603 infraction for conspiring to introduce drugs into the facility.</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy</p>
<p>223. The incarcerated individual reports that they were infraacted a 663 for intimidation or coercion but reports that the incident did not happen as the officer said it did.</p>	<p>The OCO reviewed the infraction and appeal packet, incident reports from other staff members, hearing audio and several videos related to the 709 infraction that was reduced to a 663. The 663 element "the offender used body language, words or actions to intimidate (fear for one's safety) or coerce another person" was met when the individual told the staff member she was "hot" and that she should add them on Facebook. This showed they attempted to coerce the staff into an inappropriate personal relationship. There is also video footage of the individual blocking the entry to the officer's desk area that substantiates the officer's statement in the infraction narrative.</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy</p>
<p>224. The incarcerated individual reports he is in danger in the unit he is currently housed. The individual reports DOC is continuously placing him in units that are dangerous for him. The individual is approved for transfer to another facility but is concerned that facility might become unsafe for him as well. DOC staff recently informed him he will be moved out of his temporary placement back to the housing unit.</p>	<p>The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO reviewed the individual's central file and found DOC responded to the individual's safety concerns by transferring the individual to a facility he agrees will be safe for him. This process is explained in DOC 300.380 Classification and Custody Facility Plan which states that facility placement will be consistent with Department needs and will address safety and security issues, including separation and facility prohibitions." The incarcerated individual was transferred to that facility the day after the OCO received this concern.</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy</p>
<p>225. Patient states he is still experiencing pain and loss of dexterity following multiple injuries to the same area. He has been seen by a provider but did not receive enough care. He requests further specialist testing and evaluation.</p>	<p>The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of the Health Plan. The OCO contacted health services management to discuss the patient's care. The OCO also reviewed the patient's health records. The patient's case has been consulted on by multiple specialists with no acute treatment recommendations made due to the permanent nature of the condition.</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy</p>

## 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