

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).

Case Closure Reason	Meaning	Total
Assistance Provided	The OCO achieved full or partial resolution of the person's complaint.	37
Information Provided	The OCO provided self-advocacy information.	72
DOC Resolved	DOC staff resolved the concern prior to OCO action.	25
Administrative Remedies Not Pursued	The incarcerated person did not yet pursue internal resolution per RCW 43.06C.040(2)(b).	31
Substantiated Without Resolution	The OCO verified the concern but was unable to achieve a resolution to the concern.	6
Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate	Insufficient evidence existed to substantiate the concern.	19
No Violation of Policy	The OCO determined that DOC policy was not violated.	36
Unexpected Fatality Review	The incarcerated person died unexpectedly, and the death is under review.	0
Person Left DOC Custody	The incarcerated person left DOC custody prior to OCO action.	3
Person Declined OCO Involvement	The person did not want the OCO to pursue the concern or the OCO received no response to requests for more information.	2
Lacked Jurisdiction	The complaint did not meet OCO's jurisdictional requirements (typically when complaint is not about an incarcerated person or not about a DOC action).	11
Declined	The OCO declined to investigate the complaint per WAC 138-10-040(3).	2

Monthly Outcome Report: September 2022

Complaint Summary		Outcome Summary	Case Closure Reason
Airway Heights Corrections Center			
1.	Person states he had a hip replacement this year. The surgeon recommended medical shoes and he was approved for them. Has not been sized for medical shoes.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
2.	Person says DOC violated policy by opening their loved one's legal mail. Person says although the envelope was not marked as legal mail it was identifiable as coming from a county prosecutor's office.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
3.	External person reports that loved one sent in numerous kites reporting that his knee is out of socket. She reports DOC has sent kites to him saying they do not believe him and that they will not assist him in getting x-rays or an MRI.	The OCO contacted health services about this concern. DOC reports two knee injuries, most recently six weeks ago, and care including anti-inflammatory medications, ice, and an ACE wrap. DOC communicated pain improvement however also noted swelling. After OCO outreach, DOC referred the patient to physical therapy and ordered an x-ray.	Assistance Provided
4.	Incarcerated person says that medical staff are not properly administering her hormone regimen. Person says that she asked to have medication increased out of the mid-range dose because it is showing signs of no longer being as effective. Instead, medical are testing out of the medication's protocol in an attempt to reduce the dosage. Patient transferred facilities and expressed Hormone Replacement Therapy (HRT) issues had been resolved via phone with the OCO; however, she is still concerned her approved surgeries are not scheduled.	The OCO contacted the patient then followed up with health services and DOC Trans Care Navigator. DOC then sent relevant documentation to the specialist and the OCO verified the surgery consult is now scheduled. There is a medical hold in place to ensure appointment access. The OCO added this case to the office's appointment tracker.	Assistance Provided
5.	The incarcerated individual says that staff are not leaving a copy of the cell search report per DOC policy before leaving the cell after a search. The individual says that when staff are performing searches they are taking items out of the cell to the officer's station to sort through items which can cause items to get mixed up with other cells and confiscated	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO reviewed the individual's resolution request response and found that DOC staff stated they would speak to unit staff about following DOC policy and providing search reports in individuals' cells. The OCO spoke with DOC about the issues after they provided this response and DOC explained that new staff in the unit have been the main reason for the	Assistance Provided

items are omitted from the report.

issues related to searches. DOC staff agreed to speak with the unit staff again regarding expectations for cell searches. Specifically, staff have been instructed to leave cell search reports in the cells and to be respectful of individuals' items when searching them.

6.	Incarcerated individual applied for Extended Family Visits (EFVs) with his out-of-state relatives and DOC denied them. DOC explained the reason for the denial was because he did not have a positive review from his counselor about participation in required behavioral programming. The individual was told by program staff that he was ineligible for the behavioral program because he was assessed as low risk. The individual is concerned about the reason for the EFV denial.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO spoke with DOC staff to understand the reason for the EFV denial. The conversation prompted DOC to make a plan that would address the concerns they had about allowing this family EFVs and overturned the denial. The individual and his family will now be allowed to have EFVs.	Assistance Provided
7.	Incarcerated individual reports an issue with the unit laundry. He reports that he should be getting fresh sheets in exchange for dirty ones but the individuals have only been able to get fresh sheets about seven times in the past year. The individual spoke with the DOC staff who said they are aware of the problem and they are working on getting it fixed. The individual reports it was briefly fixed but after a few weeks the problems returned. Individuals in the unit have been washing their own sheets and then going a night or two without any bedding because they are drying in their cell.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO spoke with DOC staff and verified that DOC purchased more linens so that clean linens would be available to exchange. The OCO monitored the issue to ensure that it had been addressed by facility staff and resolved.	Assistance Provided
8.	The incarcerated individual was sent to segregation and was not allowed to bring their personal property which included their denture cup. DOC staff told them to use a milk carton for their dentures. However, DOC staff threw away the milk carton that contained their partial. DOC refuses to make a new partial unless this person pays for it.	The OCO provided assistance by working with DOC Health Services Management to confirm the patient's appointment with dental was scheduled. The OCO's review revealed new information regarding the loss of the dentures. The OCO then verified the cost for the patient and the process for replacing the dentures. The OCO provided information regarding cost and process to the patient so that he may achieve a resolution for this issue. 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.	Assistance Provided
9.	Incarcerated individual reports they paid to have their property shipped to their new facility. The individual later found out that	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO verified the individual can request records from inmate banking to confirm the	Assistance Provided

	the facility they transferred from did not receive notice that the individual sent payment for the shipping costs and their property was mistakenly disposed of. The property contained the receipts for the items, so the individual is worried their tort claim will be denied because they do not have proof of purchase.	purchases of the lost items free of charge and explain in their tort claim filing that the receipts were lost with the items thrown away. The OCO provided information regarding how to file a tort claim related to the missing property. DOC also responded to the individual in a resolution request explaining to the individual that they agree the property and funds transfer were mishandled, therefore the individual should file a tort claim to be reimbursed.	
10.	The incarcerated individual reports he is being transferred out to active mainline where he would be unsafe. He went to his FRMT and told them about his circumstances and was told that his safe harbor status would be noted.	The OCO met with the Airway Heights Leadership to alert them to this concern. Once the DOC concluded their investigation into his safe harbor status, DOC agreed to transfer him to a safe harbor facility.	Assistance Provided
11.	The incarcerated individual reports that he sustained a lower back, neurological injury. He filed a medical emergency grievance and was given various treatments. For the past month he has been unable to stand up. He has severe pain and trouble sleeping. He spoke with his provider and had an x-ray and the provider says there is no issue and recommended physical therapy. He has seen physical therapy for his back in the past and it exacerbated the pain. It is greatly impacting his daily living.	The OCO contacted health services to request they address this medical concern. DOC reports the patient has been working with his primary care provider and DOC orthopedics. Patient initially declined medication but later agreed to the medication at an appointment that occurred after OCO outreach. Due to progression of conditions, DOC agreed to order an MRI for assessment. The OCO added this case to the office's appointment tracker.	Assistance Provided
12.	Incarcerated individual states that they cannot believe that DOC is paying for people who are transgender men who want to be women.	The OCO has declined to review this concern. Per WAC 138-10-040, the ombuds may decline to investigate any complaint or close any investigation of any complaint if the complaint does not allege a violation of policy, procedure, or law.	Declined
13.	External person reported their loved one is not receiving mail.	The OCO was able to verify with the facility that his mail was delayed, however he is receiving his mail.	Information Provided
14.	Person reports he was sent to the hospital and his personal items went missing while he was gone. He wants to make a tort claim.	Individuals who have been harmed or who have suffered a loss as a result of negligent actions by a state employee or agency can submit a tort claim to the Office of Risk Management (ORM). ORM is required by law (RCW Chapter 4.92) to receive these claims.	Information Provided
15.	The incarcerated individual reports that when he transferred facilities, his piano keyboard was lost and property staff at both facilities report that they do not know where it is.	The OCO provided information regarding how the individual can file a Tort Claim if his property has been lost. This office also spoke with property staff at the individual's current and previous facilities, and the DOC reports they do not have any record of his keyboard	Information Provided

being in their property rooms or it being sent or received by either facility.

16.	Incarcerated person is on a DOSA sentence and is having difficulty providing samples for his required urinalysis in a timely manner. Medical has told him to drink more water but has not helped. The person is afraid he will lose his DOSA status if he cannot provide a sample.	The OCO provided information regarding the process to request accommodation for urinalysis timelines. The patient will need to contact his mental health counselor to be evaluated for a Health Status Report.	Information Provided
17.	The incarcerated individual reports that when he transferred facilities, he lost his beads out of his hobby box. He filed a tort claim for the beads but it was denied.	The OCO provided information regarding how the individual can write to DES if he believes the Tort Claim should be reconsidered.	Information Provided
18.	The incarcerated individual reports that there is a bill that allows individuals to apply for a housing voucher 60 days prior to their release date. The individual would like to get a housing voucher.	The OCO provided information regarding the housing voucher, the referral process, and steps the individual may take to potentially receive the voucher.	Information Provided
19.	The incarcerated individual reports that there used to be a carbon copy of the resolution request form so there was a record of it being written but it was taken away. Now when individuals write their grievance they submit it and there is no record or proof it was written. The individual wants to be able to have a copy of the resolution request when they file it for staff accountability.	The OCO provided information regarding carbon copy resolution request forms. The OCO explained that DOC does use carbon copy paper for resolution requests. If a unit is out of carbon copy forms, the incarcerated individual may kite or kiosk the resolution office at their facility and the resolution specialist with re-stock the unit with forms.	Information Provided
20.	Person states DOC is holding his mail back because it has tested positive for drugs. DOC says he is under investigation.	The OCO met with the Airway Heights leadership to discuss this concern. The OCO verified his mail was delayed; however he was still receiving his mail. Any mail that did test positive for drugs will be confiscated for further testing.	Information Provided
21.	Incarcerated person submitted a DOC resolution request approximately three months ago regarding a delayed cancer diagnosis and treatment and has not received a response from DOC. Instead, person received responses about other grievances that were already resolved.	The OCO reviewed documented grievances and contacted DOC to request response on the reported grievance. DOC reports they could not identify the record and is actively processing the grievance that was refiled about this concern. The OCO also confirmed that patient had a recent oncology appointment and that there is a follow up appointment scheduled. This office provided information to the patient for following up if he has active medical concerns for which he would like OCO assistance.	Information Provided
22.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about DOC staff raiding their room and taking several items. The individual does not have funds to replace these items.	The OCO reviewed the grievance related to this concern and see that the individual was advised to provide a rewrite twice but did not do so. The OCO also contacted property about these concerns where there is a record about	Information Provided

two of the items coming into the facility but no record of the remaining items. The OCO also met by phone to clarify the concern with the individual. As the individual states that the property is still missing, the OCO advised the individual that they would need to file a tort claim for the missing items as they cannot be located.

23.	Incarcerated individual requests information about what policy outlines timeframes for the End of Sentence Review Committee (ESRC) to complete a forensic psychological evaluation.	The OCO provided information regarding the process of receiving a forensic psychological evaluation. This process is governed by DOC 350.500 End of Sentence Review/ Sexually Violent Predator Civil Commitment. When an individual has been identified through ESRC as a potential sexually violent predator (SVP) and the Indeterminate Sentence Review Board (ISRB) determines they need more information to decide whether the individual meets statutory release criteria, the ISRB will find the person "not releasable" and set a new minimum term that is shorter than usual in order for the Forensic Psychological/General Sexual Recidivism Evaluation to be completed. The ISRB would see the individual approximately 120 days prior to their new Earned Release Date (ERD), or upon completion of the evaluation. When the evaluator will complete the evaluation depends on their availability. The OCO verified with DOC that no specific timeframes for completing the evaluation exist in this process.	Information Provided
24.	The incarcerated individual reports that his property was packed out by staff who did not pack up his TV because they thought it was a rental. DOC found the TV and by that time it was damaged so he filed a tort claim and the Department of Enterprise Services (DES) denied it.	The OCO provided information regarding tort claims. The OCO reviewed the DES website and made contact with an employee who confirmed that DES does not have appeals process for denied tort claims. If a claimant disagrees with the decision made by DES, they can file a lawsuit against the state.	Information Provided
25.	Incarcerated person reports that DOC violated Washington Administrative Codes (WACs) and COVID-19 protocols when involuntarily detaining him for isolation/quarantine and testing purposes. When he submitted a complaint that violations occurred, DOC did not accept the resolution request based on the same authority of the WAC rule.	The OCO reviewed WAC 246-100-040 and WA State DOC COVID-19 Screening, Testing, and Infection Control Guidelines. This office provided information to the individual regarding DOC's authority over COVID isolation, quarantine, and testing and the most up to date guidelines.	Information Provided
26.	The incarcerated individual reports a discrepancy with his release date. This person says that they signed a plea deal for 36 months, and their sentences were	The OCO provided contact information for the DOC Records Department and advised them to contact the Records office to request a review of their time calculation.	Information Provided

supposed to run concurrently. However, DOC has changed their Max Date and taken away their good conduct time.

27.	The incarcerated individual is requesting for OCO Review Request forms to be sent to their unit since there are currently none available. This person is also requesting that the confidentiality of the OCO change to be voluntary so the monthly outcome reports can provide more accountability.	The OCO provided information regarding the confidentiality law of this office and committed to ordering more OCO Review Request Forms. RCW 43.06C.060 (3) says "[t]he ombuds shall treat all matters under investigation, including the identities of recipients of ombuds services, complainants, and individuals from whom information is acquired, as confidential, except as far as disclosures may be necessary to enable the ombuds to perform the duties of the office and support any recommendations resulting from an investigation." The OCO does not have the ability to change its own RCW. The OCO also made contact with the DOC who verified that OCO Review Request Forms are available in this person's current housing unit.	Information Provided
28.	Loved one expressed concerns about an incarcerated individual filing an infraction appeal but not receiving a response as well as the individual being taken to the hospital by ambulance and being treated for a broken nose.	The OCO reviewed the infraction and appeal packet but because the OCO was contacted several months after the incident, no video evidence was available to review due to the video retention policy. Because of the lack of video evidence, the OCO was unable to find sufficient evidence to substantiate the loved one's concerns.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
29.	A family member reports that staff is harassing their loved one and putting them in segregation. The family member reports that DOC planted something in the incarcerated individual's cell and locked them down as a result.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO determined there is no evidence to substantiate the weapon was planted. DOC staff found razors that were not claimed, so everyone in the cell received an infraction per policy.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
30.	This person declared several medical emergencies over two days. Person reports that the nurse told him to stop using drugs and stop calling medical emergencies, and that if he did not stop she would infract him. He ended up going to the hospital and had to have emergency surgery.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO reviewed the medical records related to the incident and was unable to find evidence of a denial of care or receiving an infraction for reporting symptoms. The emergency surgery was the result of DOCs emergency response. DOC health services staff treated the patient based on the symptoms presented to them and the treatment plan was changed as the reported symptoms changed.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
31.	The incarcerated individual reports that the staff was making sexual comments towards them and calling them names. This person is transgender and believes they are being targeted because of their identification.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. After conducting a review of this individual's grievances and infraction history, this office could not substantiate that any staff members	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate

have targeted this person or are treating them differently because of their gender identification.

32.	The incarcerated individual reports that their mail was rejected, and when they tried to grieve the issue, they were told that it was rejected because the book contained nudity. The person reports that the book they were requesting is an educational art book and should be accepted.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO determined that the DOC was within policy to reject the artbook. The attachment for mail policy (DOC 450.100) states that a book can be rejected if it contains sexually explicit material per WAC 137-48-020, including altered images, strategically placed graphics/items, or airbrushing.	No Violation of Policy
33.	A loved one of the incarcerated individual reports DOC continually denies their application for visitation.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by the DOC. The loved on of the incarcerated individual had their visitation application denied per DOC 450.300 Attachment 1, which states that a victim of the incarcerated individual's current offense(s) or any previous adjudicated offense is ineligible to visit that individual.	No Violation of Policy
34.	Incarcerated individual feels he is being targeted by staff as he has received infractions for things he says he did not do. He reports staff have been harassing and trying to intimidate him. He also states that he tried to appeal an infraction and the officer would not submit the appeal paperwork for him.	First, the OCO was unable to find a violation of policy by DOC regarding the individual's concern that they are being targeted by staff for infractions. The OCO reviewed the incarcerated individual's infraction history including those for minor and major violations and found that the individual has continued the infractable behavior and DOC is issuing the infractions appropriately. Second, the OCO was unable to substantiate the individual's concern that staff are not submitting their infraction appeals. The OCO reviewed the appeal document the individual provided stating that DOC would not submit the appeal for them. However, that document was completed over two months after the infraction had been issued which would be outside the timeframe for an acceptable appeal. If DOC was unwilling to accept the infraction appeal as the individual alleges, it appears that it is because the appeal was beyond the timeframe for an acceptable appeal.	No Violation of Policy
35.	Incarcerated individual states that they had an infraction hearing and informed the officer they never waived their 24 hour notice and was not given a copy of their rights. The hearing officer then refused to admit their proposed questions and ended	The OCO reviewed the infraction and appeal packet as well as the hearing audio for the infraction. As the individual expressed concerns about the policy and procedures of the hearing, and not the contents of the actual infraction itself, the OCO focused on the procedure. First, the individual signed the	No Violation of Policy

the hearing which resulted in no fair or impartial hearing.

24 hour notice form and the signature indicates that they did receive the 24 hour notice. The hearing was also held one week after this notice, providing ample notice. Second, the hearing officer denied the request for questions as per policy because it was unrelated to the contents of the infraction and was told that if the infracting officer had additional information to add, it would have been in the infraction report. Third, the person was removed from the hearing because they became argumentative with the hearings officer because of their decisions to not admit the questions. The hearing then continued without their presence which is allowable per policy.

36.	The incarcerated individual is disputing the recommendation for transfer to another facility following being found guilty of a 661 WAC violation. The individual states the maximum penalty for this violation is five-point reduction of the custody score and which would not impact his suitability to remain at that institution.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The incarcerated individual received two 661 infractions for committing sexual harassment against a staff member, visitor, or community member within two months. Due to the nature of these as well as previous infractions, a classification override was approved per DOC 300.380.	No Violation of Policy
37.	A loved one called regarding an individual being picked on and recently sent to segregation. The loved one reports that this person has a mental health diagnosis and does not pick up on social cues. The loved one is concerned that this person is being treated badly.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. Policy 460.000 states that if the Disciplinary Hearing Officer determines that the individual is guilty, the Hearing Officer may impose sanctions per WAC 137-28, DOC 460.050 Disciplinary Sanctions, and other applicable policies. The incarcerated individual has been found guilty of multiple infractions and their sanction included time spent in segregation.	No Violation of Policy
38.	Person reported that they received an infraction for indecent activities, however the staff member was of the opposite sex and did not announce themselves while doing a tier check. Person believes that the policy states the staff has to announce themselves and push the light before entering the tier.	The OCO reviewed the infraction and appeal packet and find there is evidence to substantiate the 600 infraction for tampering with a security device as the individual had their cell window covered with paper, the 750 for indecent exposure and the 651 for sexual harassment when a female staff member was conducting tier checks and the individual was naked and visibly masturbating. Further, when the officer returned with another officer, the individual was still naked. The officer routinely works on the unit, so it is likely known that her presence is common in the unit. The officer also reports that she rang the doorbell to alert that a female would be doing tier checks before entering the unit.	No Violation of Policy

Bellingham - Whatcom County

39.	Family member of an incarcerated individual reports that the closure of the Bellingham Reentry Center created a hardship for the individual and their family. The person reports unprofessional staff at new reentry center.	The OCO substantiated that the reentry center was closed. The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern of unprofessional conduct of staff due to insufficient evidence. The OCO verified with DOC that staff had met with the individual to address their staff concerns.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
-----	--	---	---------------------------------------

Bishop Lewis - King County

40.	Incarcerated individual states they were recently infractioned by a staff member who resigned. They expressed concerns about the infraction's relation to the staff member being allowed to sue DOC.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
-----	--	--	-------------------------------------

Cedar Creek Corrections Center

41.	Family member reports that their loved one has a broken tooth that is infected and very painful. He brought it to medical's attention and was given ibuprofen.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
42.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about appealing an infraction several months ago for an incident that occurred nearly a year ago but still has not received a response.	The OCO contacted the facility hearing's department who provided a copy of the appeal receipt but state they have been unable to track down the appeal. DOC states they are willing to hear an appeal from the individual now, even though it is outside the required appeal timeframe as it appears the appeal has been lost. The individual was advised that if they would like to still appeal that infraction, they will need to submit a new appeal.	Assistance Provided
43.	Incarcerated person was ordered to complete a urine analysis (UA) at a time that conflicted with a scheduled telephonic visit. Person first tried to communicate with staff to reschedule the UA, however they did not receive a response. To avoid being infractioned for the initial UA appointment, the person worked with staff the next day to reschedule the urinalysis test for the following day. Person took the test and passed but was infractioned anyway.	The OCO reviewed the infraction and appeal packet and found per the officer's statements and the individual's own statement, the individual refused the UA test with the reasoning that they had a scheduled phone call. Despite the reasoning for the refusal and the rescheduling, the element of refusing the UA test was still met and substantiated the infraction when the person refused the first test because of the phone call.	No Violation of Policy

Clallam Bay Corrections Center

44.	A loved one of the incarcerated individual reports that the individual is being harassed by officers at the facility. The loved one says that they were supposed to have a video visit, but the DOC changed the schedule the same day and the individual was not able to take a shower before the visit.	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
45.	Incarcerated individual reports that their music permit for their keyboard was denied. They believe it may have something to do with an unrelated pending infraction.	The OCO obtained a copy of the grievance and spoke with DOC facility staff directly who stated that the permit was mistakenly denied as they thought it was a hobby craft permit. When the grievance was received, the staff realized the error they had made and apologized to the individual about the mistake and told them to fill out a new permit application so it could be approved and sent to recreation. The denial of the permit had nothing to do with the infraction as the two concerns were separate.	DOC Resolved
46.	The incarcerated individual had an eye exam because his vision is similar to that of looking through film. The glasses he currently has are five years old. The individual reports DOC does not want to give him new glasses and says that his vision has not changed, but he cannot see.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. DOC has replaced the individual's glasses with new ones prior to the OCO contacting DOC. The OCO reviewed this matter prior to the individual receiving a level one resolution request response because the DOC showed the resolution request as informally resolved. However, the issue was not resolved until it was investigated by health services staff at level one of the resolution program. The individual was required to appeal the initial findings of the resolution program to receive a final resolution from health services staff.	DOC Resolved
47.	Incarcerated person reports he now qualifies for minimum security housing and is requesting a recommendation to be transferred to a suitable facility on the west side of the state to be closer to family. Person is concerned that DOC will transfer him to a facility on the east side of the state as retaliation for filing grievances.	The OCO review the incarcerated individual's custody facility plan and recommendations. The DOC did not make any recommendations to send him to an eastern prison; he was approved to move to a lower custody on the west side of the state.	Information Provided
48.	Incarcerated individual reports staff still enforce masks while in the yard even though DOC headquarters sent out a memo in March 2022 stating that incarcerated individuals do not have to mask when they are outside.	The OCO provided information regarding the August 18, 2022 DOC release related to updated COVID-19 Guidelines. The current masking guidelines for incarcerated individuals from the August 18, 2022 update states, "If community levels are low (green) and there is minimal evidence of COVID-19 activity in the resident population in each individual facility, masking will be offered but	Information Provided

not required in general areas. Masking will still be required in medical, quarantine and isolation areas. If community levels are moderate (yellow) or high (red), masking will be required in all indoor areas, including medical, quarantine and isolation areas, regardless of COVID-19 activity in the facility." The previous guidelines from a DOC memo published on March 11, 2022, stated masks were required in all indoor areas. Masking while outside at yard was required only if physical distance could not be maintained or if the facility was on any type of COVID-19 outbreak status.

49.	The incarcerated individual reports that they have two keep separate orders which are preventing them from moving to other facilities. The person reports that they attempted to have these removed but have been unsuccessful.	The OCO provided information regarding the status of this person's keep separates and how the process works to have a keep separate removed.	Information Provided
50.	The incarcerated individual was denied Extended Family Visits (EFV) with his wife. DOC claims he did not have DOC's approval before getting married. The person reports that he was not in DOC custody when he got married because his conviction was vacated and he was in county jail awaiting a new trial.	The OCO provided information regarding the next steps this person can take for EFV approval. The OCO contacted the DOC about this concern, and the DOC reported that this person can start the process for possible EFV approval by following the marriage process outlined in the DOC policy 590.200. This does not guarantee the incarcerated individual and his wife will be approved, but it is their next step in the process.	Information Provided
51.	The incarcerated individual reports that his property was lost when he while he was in the Intensive Management Unit (IMU).	The OCO provided information regarding how the incarcerated individual can file a tort claim for his lost property.	Information Provided

Coyote Ridge Corrections Center

52.	The incarcerated individual reports that his mother regularly sends him mail, but recently three letters from her were rejected. The individual appealed the rejections and asked the mailroom for photocopies but was told no. The rejections stated that the letters contained contraband but gave no other details and he has not heard anything about the appeals.	The OCO provided assistance. This office contacted the mailroom staff at the facility who confirmed they received the appeals and reported that there is an ongoing investigation. The OCO requested that the individual be given copies of the letters, and DOC staff agreed to make an exception and confirmed that the copies of the letters were delivered to the individual.	Assistance Provided
53.	Incarcerated individual explains after he reported a concern to the Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) department he began to experience harassment by DOC staff. After the individual was moved due to the PREA investigation, he began experiencing staff harassment. He filed a resolution request about the staff interactions, but the	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO reviewed the actions of DOC to determine if there was evidence to substantiate harassment related to the PREA concern filed by the individual. The OCO verified that in the duration of the PREA investigation DOC moved the individual away from the alleged PREA concern, and offered the individual	Assistance Provided

harassment continued. DOC staff searched his cell about four times in one week after he was moved. He was moved again, and shortly after that move DOC staff searched his cell again and DOC staff found drugs in his cell during this search. The individual reports that the drugs were not his and that staff did not properly complete the cell search. The individual lost his job and housing assignment as a result of this incident and wants the actions of DOC to be investigated.

policy required counseling and staff support. The OCO found the cell searches were unrelated to the PREA investigation and were initiated due to DOC staff identifying high levels of drug paraphernalia in the prison. CRCC staff has been actively searching cells to remove drugs from the facility. There is no evidence to confirm the drugs found in the individual's cell belonged to this individual; however per WAC 137-96-100 titled Cell Tag, "Each [incarcerated person] of a multiple-[person] cell will be held accountable for an infraction that occurs within the confines of such cell unless he/she can establish a lack of involvement in the infraction." This means that because the drugs were found where the individual lives, he and all other parties housed in that cell will be held responsible for them. The OCO verified that the cell search reports were not properly distributed in many cell searches and DOC has provided information to unit staff about the proper protocol for providing cell search reports. The OCO reviewed the actions of DOC in this incident and addressed concerns related to providing cell search reports directly after the cell has been searched. The OCO verified that there is no evidence to substantiate harassment by DOC staff in this incident.

54.	The incarcerated individual reports that his Earned Release Date is next year and is trying to be screened for GRE. The individual reports that he believes he is not getting assistance or information about GRE because he was convicted of a sex crime. When he has asked for help, no one has been willing to discuss GRE with him.	The OCO provided assistance. When the incarcerated individual initially contacted the OCO, DOC 390.590 had not been updated to reflect the legislative change to the GRE program. This office contacted the individual's counselor and requested he be screened upon the policy update, and the individual has now been screened for GRE.	Assistance Provided
55.	External person reported her loved one is in medium security when he was approved for camp.	The OCO reviewed the custody facility plan and verified he was approved for camp by the DOC. He has since been transferred.	DOC Resolved
56.	The incarcerated individual reports that he was approved to be transferred to another facility and is being housed in segregation pending transfer. The individual reports that awaiting transfer in segregation has caused mental health concerns and would like to be transferred to the new facility as soon as possible.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The incarcerated individual was moved to general population soon after the OCO received this concern, and later transferred to the new facility.	DOC Resolved
57.	External person reports an incarcerated individual is trying to have visits with his son approved. The external person reports DOC staff have requested multiple documents	The OCO provided information regarding DOC's process for applying for visitation. The OCO explained that the visitation application process is governed by DOC 450.300 Visits for	Information Provided

from them and it has been a difficult experience. The external reporter requests information about the process for applying for visitation.

Incarcerated Individuals. Individuals who want to visit an incarcerated individual must apply to be approved for visiting. If DOC denies a person visitation, they may appeal the visitation denial to the Headquarters Visitation department. The OCO explained that this office can review a visitation denial once the individual has appealed the denial.

58.	Incarcerated individual is advocating for wage increases as the cost of basic needs have also increased with inflation. The individual provided signatures from multiple incarcerated individuals in agreement for a wage increase.	The OCO provided information regarding the process by which DOC may increase compensation for incarcerated individuals. RCW Chapter 72.64 and DOC 700.100 Class III Work Programs govern incarcerated individuals' pay. Per 72.64.020, "[t]he secretary shall make the necessary rules and regulations governing the employment of prisoners, the conduct of all such operations, and the disposal of the products thereof, under such restrictions as provided by law." The OCO reviewed DOC 700.100 Class III Work Programs which states, "[w]orkers will be compensated for hours worked. Compensation must be supported within facility budgeted funds and will not exceed \$55 per month. Exceptions to compensation, including flat rate compensation assignments, require written, advance approval from the Assistant Secretary for Prisons/designee."	Information Provided
59.	Incarcerated person attempted to send mail to the OCO using DOC's legal mail procedures and DOC declined, sending the mail to the OCO through regular mail channels. Person states the mailroom at that facility may not believe mail to the OCO carries the same protections as legal mail.	The OCO provided information regarding DOC handling of OCO mail. Letters to and from the OCO are handled as legal mail, however they are not tracked on the legal mail log in order to prevent DOC from having a list of communications to the OCO. The incarcerated individual can file a grievance to level II and contact the OCO again if they still feel their mail is not being processed appropriately. At the time of this complaint, there was no level II grievance on file and administrative remedies had not been pursued.	Information Provided
60.	The individual is not getting any information about work release or graduated reentry (GRE) eligibility. The person reports their counselor does not seem to know whether he qualifies and is waiting for a response from headquarters.	The OCO provided this person with information regarding the graduated reentry policy in a letter.	Information Provided
61.	The incarcerated individual was moved from one facility to another. Since they arrived at the new facility staff have been harassing them and punishing them harshly. This person reports they have been infraacted three times, and their custody points went	The OCO provided information regarding this person's infractions and current custody facility plan. The OCO determined that this person has been infraacted numerous times over the last several months, and their points have decreased to a max custody level.	Information Provided

from 67 to 43. The DOC will not let this person off level one, which should have lasted only 30 days. This person believes that the facility is trying to get their points low enough to send them to max custody.

However, this person was infracted because they continually refused to be transferred from segregation to the general population. The OCO could not substantiate that staff were purposely timing their infractions to keep them on level I indefinitely. The OCO addressed the matter with DOC; DOC reported that this person has confirmed security concerns at their current max facility and created a new custody facility plan for the individual. This person is pending transfer to a new facility shortly.

62.	The individual reports that he is waiting for the custody program manager (CPM) to move him to work release. He should be classified as MI1 custody, but the DOC says he is MI3. His counselor says he is eligible and should go to work release, but the CPM has not made a decision and is only telling his family that he is on the waiting list.	The OCO provided information regarding the CPM's decision. The OCO contacted the DOC, who verified that this person has been promoted to MI1 custody, and the CPM has reviewed this person's custody facility plan. This process has been slow due to COVID and staffing shortages.	Information Provided
63.	The incarcerated individual says that they attempted to resolve a concern through the resolution program but the Resolution Coordinator missed the objective the of the complaint and provided a COVID-19 stock response. The individual was trying to address a concern of staff action during COVID-19 restricted movement. The individual reported to the resolution program that DOC staff were not allowing them the same amount of day room time as another unit.	The OCO provided information regarding DOC's COVID-19 protocols. The OCO found that the individual was housed in a unit that was not yet cleared to be on a less restrictive movement but, the unit near them had been cleared. The OCO finds that this was not communicated clearly to the individual; the OCO provided this information to them.	Information Provided
64.	The incarcerated individual reports that the DOC has not been delivering new mattresses. The individual reports that Correctional Industries (CI) has stopped production on mattresses to several facilities.	The OCO provided information regarding mattresses currently being on backorder. This office contacted Correctional Industries (CI) who confirmed they are still producing mattresses for all Washington DOC facilities.	Information Provided
65.	The incarcerated individual is reporting that therapy aid workers only make \$39 per month, but aids in other units get \$55 a month if they work up to it. The individual reports that his unit is not allowed to work up to it.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO contacted the DOC about this concern. The DOC reported the maximum pay a therapy aid position could make is \$55 per month. Therapy aides are an "on-call" position and only work the number of hours they are called for. This could mean they do not work the maximum number of hours available in a pay period.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
66.	Incarcerated individual expressed concern about receiving a 603 infraction for introduction of drugs into the facility for	The OCO reviewed the infraction and appeal packet, color evidence photos and hearing audio for a 508 infraction for throwing items	No Violation of Policy

catching something over the fence.

and a 603 for introducing drugs into the facility and find there is evidence to substantiate both infractions. There is evidence that the individual grabbed an item that was thrown over the fence from another unit and attempted to hide the item by giving it to another individual once they saw staff. That item was a toilet paper roll and inside the roll was a piece of paper with a cashapp username for payment and a crystal powder inside of a glove that tested positive for meth.

67.	The incarcerated individual reports that his request for work release was denied. The individual says that he was not told the reason for the denial or how to appeal the decision.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by the DOC. Due to local victim safety concerns, the incarcerated individual's work release request was initially denied and the decision was upheld through the Headquarters Community Screening Committee (HCSC). Per DOC 300.500, HCSC denial decisions are final and cannot be appealed.	No Violation of Policy
68.	The incarcerated individual's daughter requested and appealed an extended family visit (EFV) denial with her father. She was denied because "[s]he cannot have an EFV with a like relationship with the person." The person reports he has not had any domestic violence charges with this family member or current wife.	The OCO could not identify evidence to substantiate a violation of policy by DOC. Policy 590.100 (10) says an individual with any documented history/indicator of domestic violence will be excluded from EFV privileges with the following: Persons with a like relationship to the individual as a victim (e.g., individuals who assaulted a spouse/state registered domestic partner, intimate partner) will be precluded from visits with a spouse or state registered domestic partner. The OCO determined that this person had assault charges, and because the assaults were against people close to this person, the DOC has denied EFVs with his daughter.	No Violation of Policy
69.	Incarcerated individual reports release date has been recalculated because of <i>Blake</i> decision, has been told release date is in 2023 instead of in September 2022.	This person was released from custody prior to OCO involvement.	Person Left DOC Custody Prior to OCO Action

Larch Corrections Center

70.	The incarcerated individual reports his hobby box was stolen while staff packed his belongings for his transfer to segregation. His counselor told him to file a tort claim, but he has not received the decision.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
71.	Incarcerated individual has an infraction concern for a 752 infraction for an item testing positive for drugs as someone already	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	No Violation of Policy

took responsibility for the items in their cell, but they still got written up.

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, and despite the cellmate claiming possession, the individual was infracted for a cell tag which is allowable per policy.

Mission Creek Corrections Center for Women

72.	The incarcerated person was denied extended family visits (EFV) with her husband. They are waiting to hear back for the actual reason in the denial letter.	The OCO could not identify evidence to substantiate a violation of policy by DOC. Policy 590.100 (10) says an individual with any documented history/indicator of domestic violence will be excluded from EFV privileges with the following: Persons with a like relationship to the individual as a victim (e.g., individuals who assaulted a spouse/state registered domestic partner, intimate partner) will be precluded from visits with a spouse or state registered domestic partner. The OCO determined that this person has previous domestic violence charges with their partner, which is why the DOC has denied their EFVs.	No Violation of Policy
-----	---	---	------------------------

Monroe Correctional Complex

73.	Person states that per DOC 700.00 regarding programs, they should be allowed at a class two programming for Correctional Industries, but they are currently at level three gratuity.	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
74.	Person reports DOC is not providing correctly trained staff to perform pat and strip searches. She filed a PREA because an officer was inappropriate during a pat search. She was unable to go to an outside medical appointment because a proper strip search was not performed.	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
75.	Person reports he has chronic back pain and history of related surgery. The shelves in the cell are under the bed, causing him pain when he uses the shelves. He has to get on his hands and knees, but his back seizes up. He was asking for an ADA cell with different shelving or an HSR to use top bunk for shelving.	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

76.	Person states his room was searched. His hobby box, religious items box, and pipe package were removed. A half hour later he was called to the conference room and was handed back items that were in his sacred items box. It appears they went through his religious items without the chaplain. He was packed out by officers when he was transferred, there may be religious items mixed with his hobby 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
77.	The incarcerated individual reports that he was moved to E unit and he wants to go back to C unit. This person believes that DOC is retaliating against them for previous grievances that this person had filed.	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
78.	Person reports her therapist is not filing the needed paperwork for her treatment plan to be moved forward. There is no clear protocol or timeline for the patient receiving gender affirming care.	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
79.	The incarcerated individual reports that funds are being taken from his banking account. This person reported that when new money is deposited, a percentage is taken from the new money and the existing money in the account when it should only be taken from the new money. The individual also reported that they could not transfer their spendable account or paycheck to their savings.	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
80.	Incarcerated person reports that the heat mitigation plan implemented last year is not being followed this year. Person says that curtains are allowed during the summer months during certain daytime hours; however, person says there is no penological interest in enforcing this rule because daylight can still get in through the window above and it sets up persons with memory issues for negative BOE's or infractions if they forget to open the curtains after the allowable time frame during the day. Person says last year they were allowed to tape off the windows. Person does not understand why a new set of rules is being imposed this year.	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

81.	The individual reports that he is having medical concerns because the DOC told him an x-ray would be better than an MRI for his back pain. The individual reports that he received an MRI outside of the facility, and DOC refused to look at it. This person has been going through this process for nine years and filed emergency grievances, but DOC says his concern was satisfied.	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.	The incarcerated individual never received a copy of their Level II grievance or the extension request for the Level II response. The individual reports that when he asks for a copy of the grievance, no one will give it to him.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO contacted the DOC about this concern. The DOC reported that they would look into the concern and ensure that the individual receives a copy of their Level II grievance response.	Assistance Provided
83.	Incarcerated individual reported staff misconduct concerns. A staff member is targeting LGBTQI people and harassing them. The staff member did not complete paperwork and missed a check box which prevented the incarcerated person from getting a job. She feels she is being targeted for being LGBTQI and preventing access to job due gender and sexual orientation.	The OCO met with facility leadership to discuss these concerns. The OCO confirmed that the staff misconduct is under investigation and verified that the job screening paperwork was completed. The job the individual had wanted that they did not receive was due to an MDT decision. The facility leadership is looking into having her re-screened.	Assistance Provided
84.	Incarcerated individual reports a DOC staff member said a derogatory statement related to his Jewish faith when DOC was passing out religious items boxes. The individual reports this is when the issues with DOC staff began. He is now being discriminated against because he is Jewish. The discrimination is shown by a lack of effort from DOC staff in assisting him into placement for a job and/or programming. The individual has sent kites and filed resolution requests to DOC staff about access to employment and/or programming and did not receive responses.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO spoke with DOC facility staff and requested the allegations be investigated. The OCO monitored the investigation and obtained the results of the investigation from DOC. The DOC could not substantiate the allegations of discrimination. The OCO reviewed the investigation and verified there was no evidence to substantiate the claims. The OCO also verified that the individual is on the job lists and will be placed in a position as soon as one becomes available. The OCO verified the individual's resolution request is pending at Headquarters level.	Assistance Provided
85.	Incarcerated individual reports a false PREA was filed against him and he consequently received an infraction.	The OCO reviewed the PREA investigation and challenged the findings based on new information that was not included in the investigation. The OCO provided assistance by meeting with DOC leadership at the facility to discuss the findings and share new information regarding the individuals involved. Based on this new information, the PREA finding was changed to unsubstantiated and the infraction was dismissed.	Assistance Provided
86.	The incarcerated individual reports that he was approved to receive 46 days of good conduct time restoration. At this time, his	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO contacted the DOC about this person's good conduct time restoration. The DOC reported	Assistance Provided

early release date (ERD) does not reflect the restored good conduct time, and he is concerned about the timeliness of this process. This person has to have a hearing before his scheduled release date, but because the good time has not been restored, he does not know when he can appear. The individual reports that he has filed a grievance but was told there is an appeal process, which he tried to utilize, but was told it was too late.

that this person had earned 40 days of good conduct time, but it had not yet been applied to their ERD. The OCO followed up with staff at headquarters, who later made the appropriate changes to this person's ERD.

87.	The incarcerated individual reports that he has not received a response to his level three Resolution Request.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The incarcerated individual contacted the OCO shortly after reporting this concern and informed this office that he received the level three response to his Resolution Request.	DOC Resolved
88.	The individual has reported before that they self-harmed due to staff not answering the emergency call button. Last night, an incarcerated person was assaulted and was pressing the emergency button, and the DOC staff did not respond until much later. The reporter explained that he had reported this issue to our office before, and we stated that retraining would be happening, but staff are still hanging out in the hallway and not available to answer the emergency call button.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO reviewed this person's resolution request regarding this issue and determined that the DOC addressed this person's specific concerns. The DOC re-established the zoning of this area, interviewed staff members to make sure they are aware of where their post is located, reminded people to get coverage if they must leave their area, and worked with the security specialist to update the post orders for this unit. The DOC is aware of this issue and is working to improve its performance.	DOC Resolved
89.	The incarcerated individual submitted a healthcare directive to the DOC for their last will in case they die in custody. If their body is in DOC custody, they want to make sure that they are not cremated or embalmed because it is against their faith. This person sent this directive to the health services department.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO contacted Health Services Management and were informed the patient has been sent a DOC healthcare directive form to be filled out with their counselor. DOC 620.010 Advance Directives does not address a person's wishes for disposition after death.	DOC Resolved
90.	Incarcerated individual reported that their HSR that allowed them to use a mouth swab instead of a producing a urine sample was taken away. Person feels that this is not appropriate because they have problems producing urine.	The incarcerated individual contacted the OCO and said the issue was resolved. The OCO was able to verify that the HSR had been renewed by DOC medical.	DOC Resolved
91.	The incarcerated individual reports that he is due to release in the coming months, but his counselor is not helping with his release plan.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. Shortly after the incarcerated individual reported this concern regarding his release planning, his Release Plan (ORP) was approved.	DOC Resolved

92.	External person reports that DOC Headquarters added another individual on her correspondence regarding her loved one and it broke confidentiality. External person believes it was retaliation.	The OCO reviewed the concern and determined there was an email accidentally added to the email correspondence that was later recalled by DOC staff. The OCO could not substantiate this was retaliation from DOC staff. Staff sent an apology and the email was recalled.	Information Provided
93.	External person reports that another incarcerated individual in the unit is allowed to display bad behavior and has no consequences for it because they are favored by DOC staff. This is impacting the unit and her loved one.	The OCO reviewed the multiple resolution requests regarding staff misconduct concerns submitted by the incarcerated individual. One resolution request is currently under investigation at a level 1 and the other resolution request was administratively withdrawn for review by the appointing authority, per DOC policy 850.010. The appointing authority will determine the scope of the investigation, who will conduct it, review the results and determine the appropriate action to be taken. Once these investigations are complete, the OCO can review the outcome. This office provided information to the incarcerated individual outlining next steps.	Information Provided
94.	External person reported their loved one has stage 4 cancer and was moved to isolation due to potential COVID-19 in his unit, but testing was never performed. In addition, DOC staff in the isolation unit were not made aware of his health issues when he was moved.	The OCO contacted the Health Services Administrator regarding this concern. This office verified that a COVID outbreak did occur in the unit mentioned in the complaint and individuals with compromised immune systems were moved to isolation for their own protection while the unit was on quarantine. The individuals who were exposed are being tested regularly. Health services are aware that he is in isolation and his HSR needs are listed in OMNI.	Information Provided
95.	Incarcerated person was notified he will be transferring to a facility where he may potentially be harmed by other incarcerated individuals. The DOC is aware of this threat and the most reasonable course of action would be to retain housing him at his current facility for the remainder of his sentence.	The OCO review his updated custody facility plan that was completed last week. The DOC did not recommend a transfer to a different facility and this individual will stay at his current facility.	Information Provided
96.	Incarcerated person reports experiencing pain weeks after a procedure. Person attempted to file a medical emergency but it was not accepted because it did not meet the criteria. Person waited several days before being seen by medical and was only prescribed ibuprofen for the pain and told to purchase a stronger pain reliever from commissary. The person is requesting financial compensation.	The OCO provided information to the patient regarding tort claims to assist the patient in reaching their requested resolution for monetary compensation. Individuals who have been harmed or who have suffered a loss as a result of negligent actions by a state employee or agency can submit a tort claim to the Office of Risk Management (ORM). ORM is required by law (RCW Chapter 4.92) to receive these claims. The OCO also verified the patient received care and follow up with	Information Provided

the oral surgeon through communication with DOC Health Services management.

97.	Incarcerated person appealed an infraction but was not provided a receipt for the appeal. Person attempted to communicate with staff that they did not get the receipt but was told receipts are no longer given for appeals. Person further reached out to administrative staff but their resolution has not yet been met.	The OCO reviewed the concern and saw that the infraction appeal was just recently received by the facility and is still being processed. The individual was advised of this.	Information Provided
98.	Incarcerated person states that a Resolution Request that they previously filed came back from Headquarters as substantiated and the DOC stated that they would correct everything the person requested. However, they have now received a letter from the Resolution Program stating that the resolution would now not be granted. Person says that they are not allowed to rescind on what must be honored and completed per Resolution Program Manual.	The OCO reviewed the resolution request. The concern listed in the resolution request was regarding time calculations and sentencing. The OCO confirmed the individual's sentence and time calculation with the records department at the DOC Headquarters. The DOC does not have the authority to change an incarcerated individual's sentencing structure. Even if a miscalculation was accidentally given in a resolution request response, it does not change the actual sentence that was given by a court of law. The records department has communicated the correct sentencing information to this individual. The ERD reflected on record is correct.	Information Provided
99.	The incarcerated individual reports that he is not from Washington and will be on community custody in this state for one year upon his release. He is concerned about getting identification, a social security card, and other documents required for occupational and personal needs.	The OCO provided information regarding DOC 380.550 and DOC 350.200, which address how the incarcerated individual may acquire these and other important documents and resources.	Information Provided
100.	Incarcerated individual requested a keep separate order from an incarcerated individual who was threatening him at another facility. This was reported once he arrived at Monroe and learned that that the incarcerated individual was coming to his facility. He says DOC staff told him not to worry about it but he then was assaulted by the individual.	The OCO verified that the individual was housed in a separate unit from the aggressor. However, he was assaulted in a common outside area. DOC Policy requires separate requests to be reviewed by a HQ committee, which created a delay in the process. The OCO reviewed the Resolution Request that was investigated at level 3 by the DOC. The delay was substantiated in the level 3 resolution request response. The OCO could not find evidence to substantiate that DOC staff told the incarcerated individual not to worry about it, as they did submit his separation request.	Information Provided
101.	The incarcerated individual reports that he has not received his third stimulus check. He is requesting that the OCO look further into this issue.	The OCO provided the IRS's contact information and the next steps this person can take to inquire about their missing stimulus check.	Information Provided
102.	The incarcerated individual reports that he is on a Halal diet, but is being served breakfasts	The OCO provided information regarding the preparation of Halal meals. This office spoke	Information Provided

	prepared by other incarcerated individuals in the facility, which is not Halal.	with the kitchen manager, who confirmed that Halal breakfast trays are shipped to the facility and are not prepared by other incarcerated individuals.	
103.	The incarcerated individual reports that when he was taken into custody by Community Corrections, his property was taken and now DOC staff are unable to locate it.	The OCO provided information regarding how the individual can file a tort claim if his property was lost. This office does not have jurisdiction over Community Custody concerns.	Information Provided
104.	Incarcerated individual reports that at a Facility Risk Management Team (FRMT) meeting staff explained to him that he does not qualify for Extended Family Visits (EFVs) because he has an adjudicated federal detainer. The individual reports he knows of other people who have a federal detainer who have EFVs. He does not understand why he would not qualify.	The OCO provided information to the individual regarding Extended Family Visits (EFVs). Per DOC 590.100 Extended Family Visits, "[t]he individual must not have any outstanding or unresolved felony charges or detainers in any jurisdiction, and must not be a suspect in a criminal investigation by any law enforcement agency. Immigrations and Customs Enforcement (ICE) detainers will not be considered when determining eligibility for EFV privileges." The OCO explained to the individual that because the federal detainer will be acted on after he serves time for the state, this detainer is unresolved. DOC does not recognize ICE detainers in the same way because the person with an ICE detainer may or may not be apprehended for the detainer after they release from state custody.	Information Provided
105.	Incarcerated person expressed concerns about current facility operations. Person says they are currently on cluster status despite no positive cases for COVID-19 and they are threatened with major infractions for not properly wearing a mask.	The OCO met with facility leadership regarding this concern. The DOC has taken the stance that masks need to be worn at all times if the unit falls within the county masking protocol. A warning will be given, then a negative BOE, then a minor infraction and continued behavior could lead to a major infraction. The OCO could not find evidence to substantiate that the DOC is forcing quarantines without positive COVID-19 cases.	Information Provided
106.	The incarcerated individual reports that he wants a job in maintenance or construction, but has not been given that type of job due to mental health and safety concerns.	The OCO provided information regarding job referrals the individual currently has open. This office also recommended the individual work with his counselor to discuss his job options.	Information Provided
107.	External individual reports an incarcerated individual was held in the Intensive Management Unit (IMU) without a hearing. The external individual reports the incarcerated individual has since been moved from the IMU but IMU placements have a negative impact on incarcerated individuals' mental health. The external individual reports staff are targeting him by	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO found that DOC placed the individual in IMU pending an infraction. DOC does place people under investigation in IMU while staff investigate the allegations and if the threat to safety and security is found while the individual is under investigation.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate

placing him in IMU without any infraction or disciplinary hearing.

108.	The incarcerated individual was recommended for placement at a facility where he believes he would be in danger. The individual reports that DOC staff are not addressing his concerns.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The incarcerated individual does not have any Security Threat Group (STG) affiliations or separations on file at the facility. The individual has not been in Washington State custody for many years. This office provided information on who the individual may contact to address his safety concerns.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
109.	The incarcerated individual says that he wanted to alert OCO that staff is starting to act crazy. The individual is concerned that the facility is going to increase his medication or send him to the close observation area (COA). This person also reports that DOC is scaring him with their demands. He has a hearing tomorrow and does not know why it is happening.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO reviewed this persons' electronic file and could not determine that this person has any upcoming hearings scheduled. This office also made contact with the DOC who reported that this person might be referring to the recent facility risk management team meeting regarding his custody facility plan. This office wrote this person a letter requesting that they file a grievance with specific details about their circumstances.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
110.	The individual reports that the tort claim investigators have denied all of his claims. This person reports that he has filed 90 tort claims, and none have been approved. The tort claims are related to issues with gratuity from his previous jobs.	The OCO lacks jurisdiction to investigate this complaint because the complaint relates to an action taken by an agency other than the Washington State Department of Corrections.	Lacked Jurisdiction
111.	Incarcerated individual had their judgment and sentence (J&S) modified due to the <i>State v. Blake</i> decision. Their new J&S says that they should be receiving all of the days they spent in county jail and the days that they have spent in prison as time served. DOC records department is not recognizing their county jail time as time served. Their new sentence should be five months less than it is.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. Per RCW 9.94A.505(6), "[t]he sentencing court shall give the [person] credit for all confinement time served before the sentencing if that confinement was solely in regard to the offense for which the [person] is being sentenced." This means that the two other sentences they are serving are to be run concurrently which means they are not eligible for jail time while awaiting conviction for the second charge.	No Violation of Policy
112.	The incarcerated individual's parole was revoked and he was housed in the Intensive Management Unit (IMU) for over 50 days awaiting the classification hearing. The individual reports that DOC uses COVID-19 as an excuse for the delay and he should have been on the chain bus a few weeks ago.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO reviewed this person's electronic file and verified that their parole was revoked, and they were housed in the IMU waiting for their hearing. Incarcerated individuals can be held in administrative segregation for longer than 30 days with approved extensions. Policy 320.200 says states that the Ad Seg Hearing Officer will	No Violation of Policy

update individuals on their status every seven days when they have been on Ad Seg for more than 30 days.

113.	A loved one reports that the incarcerated individual is not receiving his mail. The mailroom rejected all of the books and magazines they have sent to the individual. The loved one does not understand because these magazines have been allowed in the past.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO reviewed the mail rejections and determined that the books had provocative pictures, which was the reason for the mailroom rejection. The attachment for mail policy (DOC 450.100) states that a book can be rejected if it contains sexually explicit material per WAC 137-48-020, including altered images, strategically placed graphics/items, or airbrushing.	No Violation of Policy
114.	A loved one of the incarcerated individual reports that the individual's phone was disconnected and was told that due to COVID-19, the individual could not make phone calls for five days. The loved one also reported that the individual was not given anything to write with and could not contact his family or his attorney.	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
115.	The incarcerated individual says that she has a history of sexual assault and should be put in a single cell for her protection per the transgender and gender nonconforming policy. She fears for her safety and wants a permanent single cell assignment but DOC has refused.	The OCO contacted DOC Custody Program Manager (CPM) to discuss single cell placement options. CPM reports the individual's placement is related to mental health treatment planning and the individual does not qualify for single cell housing at this time. The person is currently in a room without a roommate. Roommates will be assessed for safety risks and the individual was provided information about how to request or appeal roommates and report immediate threats to safety if they arise. DOC did not agree to single cell placement.	Substantiated Without Resolution

Olympic Corrections Center

116.	A loved one of the incarcerated individual reports that there was a problem with the individual's paperwork and that he may not get released on his Earned Release Date (ERD)	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. Shortly after this concern was reported to the OCO, this office confirmed the individual has an approved Planned Release Date (PRD) ten days earlier than his Earned Release Date (ERD).	DOC Resolved
117.	The incarcerated individual was told to provide a urinalysis (UA) test and they could not give a sample on their first attempt. A new officer came to collect the sample, but they did not follow policy by washing their hands or doing a strip search. A second officer came and gave the individual a UA using the same cup from the first attempt.	The OCO reviewed the infraction and appeal packet and contacted facility management to review the concerns including an inexperienced officer verbally informing the individual and several witnesses that they were untrained in this area and staff did not change gloves between the handling of samples. The facility management states they	No Violation of Policy

The incarcerated individual got a couple drops of urine in the cup but not enough to produce a sufficient sample. They tried one more time and the officer stopped them and said the UA was dirty. The individual received an infraction for a dirty UA. The individual reports that policy says they are allowed to send the cup out for a second test, but the cup has already been destroyed. They believe that the DOC has tampered with evidence.

confirmed with the officer who conducted the UA that they had been provided proper training before conducting the UA. They also re-reviewed the video footage and found the alleged inexperienced officer was not involved in the actual UA procedure, just the initiating of the strip search. The facility also explained that gloves are used for sanitation purposes of the staff only, so that if urine gets on the side of the specimen cup, it will not get onto staff's hands when they handle the cup. Gloves are not designed for sterilization purposes, and it is not a DOC policy to change gloves between handling samples. Lastly, DOC understood and sympathized with the individual's concerns and as a result decided to suspend the loss of good conduct time sanction.

Other – Statewide, Out of State, Jails, Community Custody

118.	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
119.	External person is reporting they cannot sign up for a visit with a loved one.	The OCO verified that this incident took place at a California State Prison. The OCO lacks jurisdiction to investigate this complaint because the complaint relates to an action taken by an agency other than the Washington State Department of Corrections.	Lacked Jurisdiction
120.	External person reports her loved one is experiencing inhumane conditions and medical neglect at Clark County Jail.	The OCO lacks jurisdiction to investigate this complaint because the complaint relates to an action taken by an agency other than the Washington State Department of Corrections.	Lacked Jurisdiction
121.	External person reported the medical staff at SCORE will not transfer their loved one to the hospital for needed care.	This office shared the contact information for the SCORE Jail with the external reporter. However, the OCO lacks jurisdiction to investigate this complaint because the complaint relates to an action taken by an agency other than the Washington State Department of Corrections.	Lacked Jurisdiction
122.	Person reports that she was taken to jail without being read her rights. Since being in jail she has had severe medical issues go unreported. The jail is not equipped to take care of her medical issues.	The OCO lacks jurisdiction to investigate this complaint because the complaint relates to an action taken by an agency other than the Washington State Department of Corrections.	Lacked Jurisdiction

123.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about conditions and staff misconduct in the Snohomish County Jail.	Under RCW 43.06C the OCO lacks jurisdiction to investigate the concern as it relates to a jail.	Lacked Jurisdiction
124.	Person states there are discrepancies in the dates and timelines of jail time person did at various jails as well as alterations made on other jail/court records.	The OCO lacks jurisdiction to investigate this complaint because the complaint relates to an action taken by an agency other than the Washington State Department of Corrections.	Lacked Jurisdiction
Reynolds - King County			
125.	Person was injured while at work. He was able to go get medical attention but then needed further medical attention. Person feels staff was unprofessional.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO contacted DOC staff, who stated they had spoken with the person and he was given appropriate outside medical attention. The misunderstanding was resolved on site with staff and the individual.	DOC Resolved
126.	While at reentry center individual reports that all property was lost. Person filed a tort claim and DES affirmed the investigation and was offered monetary compensation for the lost items. However, DOC then found the phone. DOC was going to mail the cell phone to his family. Family member has been calling the DOC staff at the reentry center for a week trying to coordinate getting the phone back and no one is answering.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO contacted DOC staff and they were able to resolve for the person and return the property.	DOC Resolved
Stafford Creek Corrections Center			
127.	Patient states he has been waiting almost a year for an eye care appointment. He was sent to an eye specialist for a specific issue but was not given an eye exam or new prescription and glasses.	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
128.	The incarcerated individual reports that he left paperwork in the law library and another individual who he knows picked it up and was going to return it at dinner. The other individual reports that the paperwork was intercepted by DOC staff. The individual has sent a kite to several DOC staff members but he has not received a response or been given his paperwork.	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
129.	Person states DOC medical refuses to prescribe a medication that person had been prescribed in the community for chronic pain. Person says DOC is pursuing a prerequisite regimen of medication that he already tried and when he pointed this out to medical staff who did not review his	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

medical history, he was accused of being disruptive.

130.	The incarcerated individual reports that DOC staff are conducting strip searches for reasons not related to safety and security.	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
131.	The incarcerated person reports they were diagnosed with Bronchitis/Asthma because there is no proper ventilation in their unit. The person says DOC has not submitted a work order to fix the problem. The person also reports their property was stolen, and these issues combined make them want to transfer back to their previous facility.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
132.	The incarcerated individual reports that he is in the IMU on administrative segregation after receiving several infractions. The individual is concerned that he will be transferred to another facility due to the infractions.	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
133.	The incarcerated individual reports that there has been ongoing spiritual activity at the prison that should be addressed.	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
134.	The incarcerated individual reports that they wrote an urgent medical kite to see their mental health provider about PTSD symptoms and was told to kite their medical provider, not mental health. The individual also reported their mental health provider is not seeing them as often as they need.	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
135.	Individual expressed concerns about medical appointments and has grieved this concern but has not received a response yet. They state they waited two hours for an appointment and then mental health staff told them that they were a no-show.	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
136.	The incarcerated individual was provided state-issued shoes that are too small and hurt their feet. The individual has filed a resolution request but has not received a response. This is a new type of shoe that	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued

runs small, and many other incarcerated individuals are complaining that their regular shoe size does not fit.

the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.

137.	Incarcerated individual reported a medical emergency that was not handled appropriately by DOC staff. He had an asthma attack and was told by staff it was not a medical emergency. The following day different staff from the unit did call a medical emergency and he received medical care.	The OCO contacted Stafford Creek leadership to discuss the concern. The Superintendent assigned the Resolution Request to the CPM for an investigation. The Resolution Request was found to be substantiated and the Correctional Unit Supervisor spoke with staff regarding a proper response for medical emergencies.	Assistance Provided
138.	External complainant requested help with the DOC process for cremation options after a loved one passed away while in DOC custody.	The OCO contacted health services to request information about this concern. DOC confirmed the business office submitted a cremation reimbursement for approval and recognized the delay in submitting the initial documentation. DOC agreed HQ will approve and provide the family member with reimbursement. The OCO provided this information to the family member as well as DOC contacts for direct follow up.	Assistance Provided
139.	The incarcerated individual has a neurological condition and is having a difficult time getting help for his medical issues. He is trying to get a Health Status Report so he can wear shorts because he is very sensitive to heat. He also had an exacerbation last year and had to wait eight days for medication. Currently when he has an exacerbation, medical is giving him an eighth of the dose that has been ordered for him by a doctor regularly.	The OCO provided assistance by contacting the Director of Pharmacy and the patient's provider and requested they order an "as needed" course of medication to be kept on hand in case of exacerbation. The medical provider agreed to do so. The health status report was issued to the patient by the provider. The medication will have to be ordered on an "as needed" basis until the medication dose can be approved for urgent stock availability by DOC Pharmacy.	Assistance Provided
140.	Incarcerated individual reports after filing resolution requests about a DOC staff member for calling them a derogatory name, he has begun to experience retaliation from DOC staff. The individual reports he tried to elevate the resolution requests to the next investigative level, but he did not receive responses and the resolution coordinator issued extensions for the resolution requests. The individual reports that the retaliation caused him to lose his job with Correctional Industries (CI), created a barrier for him to be eligible for minimum custody, and was the reason he was issued an infraction that the individual reports he did not do. The individual reports that numerous issues occur at this facility related to retaliation and racial discrimination.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO spoke with DOC facility staff and requested the allegations of discrimination and retaliation be investigated. The OCO monitored the investigation and obtained the results of the investigation from DOC. The DOC could not substantiate the allegations of discrimination or retaliation. However, DOC staff did find a resolution request that was not investigated per policy. DOC reopened this resolution request for further investigation. After the resolution request was reopened, the individual withdrew the resolution request. The OCO verified that the individual classifies as medium custody and is on the list to be employed. The OCO was unable to substantiate the lost CI job was related to any resolution requests filed. The OCO reviewed the entire investigation and verified there was	Assistance Provided

		no evidence to substantiate the claims. The OCO prompted the DOC investigation and verified that the investigation was conducted appropriately.	
141.	The incarcerated individual says that they requested a hearing by the Indeterminant Sentence Review Board (ISRB) regarding the prohibitive placements impacting the programming recommended by the board. The board did not release them and has extended the time in confinement to complete the programming.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO contacted DOC staff multiple times about person not being able to access required programming. Following multiple communications by the OCO, DOC staff placed this person on a transfer order to a facility where required programming is available.	Assistance Provided
142.	The incarcerated individual reports that DOC staff are not enforcing the rules when other incarcerated individuals play music in their cells too loud.	The OCO provided assistance. This office contacted the CUS in the incarcerated individual's unit about this concern, who then sent out a kiosk message requesting that individuals use their headphones when playing music in their cells. The CUS also confirmed that they will continue to address this concern as it occurs.	Assistance Provided
143.	A friend of the incarcerated individual reports that he has been accused of threatening his second cellmate. The DOC said it will take two weeks to investigate. Meanwhile, he is being held in a punitive solitary confinement cell.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO confirmed that the individual returned to his unit shortly after the concern was submitted.	DOC Resolved
144.	Patient is not receiving appropriate care and follow up. He is supposed to be seen by a specialist but has not received the appointment. He saw the specialist previously and received treatment but now DOC is refusing to offer the same treatment until he sees the specialist again.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The patient contacted the OCO and informed this office he had signed paperwork for the specialist and that this case can be closed.	DOC Resolved
145.	The incarcerated individual was found guilty of a major infraction and his address book was confiscated as contraband because synthetic cannabinoids or "spice" was found on the paper of the address book. The individual has multiple phone numbers of family members in the address book and wants to get the phone numbers back to stay in touch with his family.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. DOC staff made copies of the address book and provided them to the individual prior to OCO outreach.	DOC Resolved
146.	This person is allergic to the sun and should be getting his allergy medicine 45 minutes prior to exposure. However, DOC keeps giving it to him in pill line which means he has to stand in the sun to get it. It should be in his medical records that he can have the allergy medicine in his possession, but this has not happened yet.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO made a brief outreach to the incarcerated individual with some follow up questions regarding their medication. During the discussion the individual reported that DOC was fixing the issue with their medication, and changing the directions on their newest prescription.	DOC Resolved

147.	Incarcerated individual sent a check to TV Weekly for a subscription from their inmate trust account; however, TV Weekly claims they never received the check. The individual is requesting a refund from the department for the amount of the check that appears to be lost.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. Prior to the OCO reaching out to banking at the individual's facility, the check was cleared by banking as received by the recipient. The OCO confirmed the check was cleared.	DOC Resolved
148.	Incarcerated individual reports population concern. One specific unit has been on quarantine even though there are zero COVID-19 cases.	The OCO met with facility leadership regarding this concern. The DOC had taken this unit off quarantine prior to OCO involvement. The OCO could not substantiate that the unit had zero COVID-19 cases during the quarantines.	DOC Resolved
149.	External person reported that an incarcerated individual's unit is always on COVID-19 quarantine and they are the only unit being tested. The incarcerated individual has not received property packages and his visiting is constantly canceled.	The OCO contacted facility leadership to inquire about the quarantine in the unit that was identified in the concern. The OCO verified that the quarantine was lifted and visiting would resume. The OCO could not substantiate that this unit is the only unit that has been tested for COVID-19. The OCO did substantiate a delay in receiving packages. The incarcerated individual does not have a current resolution on file for a delayed package. The OCO provided information suggesting that he submit a resolution request with his specific concern regarding a delayed package.	Information Provided
150.	Incarcerated individual reports that prices of commissary store items are increasing while incarcerated individuals wages remain the same. The individual reports that the prices were raised in June and will be raised again soon. The individual filed a resolution request about this issue and it was deemed "not accepted." The individual appealed the resolution request and it was sent to the Resolution Program Manager at DOC Headquarters, but it was still not accepted.	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." The OCO provided this information to the individual after he tried to resolve the issue within DOC.	Information Provided
151.	Incarcerated individual claims he is a relationship with a staff member. He reports	The OCO contacted facility leadership regarding this concern. Leadership had	Information Provided

	that she retaliated against him and had him infracted and taken to solitary confinement. A PREA was filed.	already assigned this concern for investigation per DOC 490.860 Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) Investigation. The incarcerated individual will be interviewed and will receive results from the investigation, once complete.	
152.	Incarcerated individual states he faced significant delays in evaluation and treatment of his backpain. The problem has been ongoing since 2017 and he has had several appointments cancelled since pre-pandemic. The patient is requesting the OCO investigate the delays in care.	The OCO contacted medical services at the facility and verified the incarcerated individual is currently receiving access to medical care. The OCO has declined to investigate the concern in the complaint that stems from 2017. WAC-138-10-040 states that the ombuds may decline to investigate any complaint or may close any investigation of any complaint if the alleged violation is a past rather than ongoing issue. The incarcerated individual stated he has already filed a tort claim with ORM, which will conduct an investigation.	Information Provided
153.	Incarcerated person has concerns about how the DOC has handled multiple circumstances around their recent diagnosis including, testing, testing results, medical information, prevention measures, and grievances this person filed pertaining to their concerns. Person alleges DOC was negligent and mishandled the outbreak situation at their facility.	The OCO provided information to assist the person in receiving their resolution. Individuals who have been harmed or who have suffered a loss as a result of negligent actions by a state employee or agency can submit a tort claim to the Office of Risk Management (ORM). ORM is required by law (RCW Chapter 4.92) to receive these claims.	Information Provided
154.	The incarcerated individual received a letter from the Supreme Court, and he is requesting that the OCO help him fill out the form because he cannot read or write.	The OCO provided contact information for the DOC contract attorney. The OCO contacted the DOC about this concern and the DOC reported that this person can contact the contract attorney for assistance with their paperwork from the court.	Information Provided
155.	The incarcerated individual reports that they are illiterate and are requesting help writing to the Clemency Board.	The OCO provided information on resources available to this person. The OCO determined that it would be against policy for the DOC to assist this person with requesting clemency. The DOC recommended using the law library's text to speech software or the contract attorney to help this person with researching and writing needs. This office provided contact information for the DOC contract attorney.	Information Provided
156.	Incarcerated person states that he has missed work and programming despite testing negative for COVID 19. He feels as though the people testing negative should not have to miss their programming. He does not understand why DOC keeps changing the protocols.	The OCO provided information regarding DOC's COVID-19 protocols being changed with the CDC's updated guidelines for congregate living conditions.	Information Provided

157.	The incarcerated individual questions why there are multiple transgender individuals housed in their pod. He reports that there are many public displays of affection between the transgender individuals. He does not feel it is fair that transgender individuals are held to different standards than everyone else.	The OCO contacted the facility and could not substantiate any violation in housing protocols by DOC in regards to transgender individuals or that transgender individuals are allowed to have public displays of affection. As this was an anonymous complaint, this office could not gather more identifying information to continue an investigation.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
158.	The incarcerated individual reports that his supervisor has approved him wearing shorts and a t-shirt while working as a porter. The individual says that while he was working, a counselor saw him and told him to return to his unit because he was not wearing khakis. The individual tried to explain to his counselor that his supervisor allows this attire during work, but the counselor wrote a negative Behavior Observation Entry (BOE) which said that he was being argumentative. The individual reports that he was not argumentative and was trying to explain the situation. The individual appealed the BOE but it was upheld.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The Behavior Observation Entry (BOE) was written because the incarcerated individual was allegedly being argumentative. Video footage does not have audio, so there is no evidence available to support the individual's account of the interaction.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
159.	The incarcerated individual reports that they were infractioned two times by the food services manager who made unfounded allegations against him and he was found guilty of both infractions. The person believes this is retaliation for the grievances he filed regarding mistakes made in food service.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO reviewed the kites that were sent from the incarcerated individual to the food services manager and determined that the infractions imposed on this person were valid. Over a two month period, the individual sent 33 kites to the food services manager with a wide range of remarks that could be viewed as harassment.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
160.	Person says that prior to transferring from their prior facility they had an active treatment plan with mental health and was prescribed medication. Upon arriving at current facility person says they notified staff of this information during the intake process and when they were seen by a mental health provider one time. Since then they have not been seen by a provider and their prescriptions have expired. They have been unmedicated for four months now.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO reviewed the patient's care with the Director of Mental Health and determined the patient had been made aware of the plan to taper off medications at a previous facility before transferring. The OCO did not find any indication that the patient's medications were discontinued without a discussion with a provider. The OCO provided information to the patient regarding the process to regain medications.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
161.	The incarcerated person reports that a scheduled release-related virtual court hearing was canceled because their unit was on quarantine. This person believes there were other reasonable location options to conduct the virtual hearing and that denying	DOC implemented policies to address COVID-19 conditions within the facilities. This office verified with the facility that this person's court hearing was temporarily rescheduled due to COVID quarantine protocols. The OCO was not able to determine the DOC actions, in	No Violation of Policy

	the hearing constitutes a violation of "meaningful access to the courts" per policy.	this case, were outside of those implemented policies.	
162.	The incarcerated individual reports that the DOC deducted the funds given to him as part of the vaccine incentive program.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The funds from the incentive program were added to the individual's spendable account. The individual signed a TV rental agreement which included a monthly fee. Per DOC 200.00, withdrawals from accounts include TV fees and rentals. This office informed the individual that he may return the rented TV if he does not wish to have the funds withdrawn from his spendable account.	No Violation of Policy
163.	Patient states he is having issues getting to see a medical provider. His appointments keep getting cancelled. He thinks he was inappropriately prescribed a mental health medication for pain.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO learned from Health Services management that the delays were a result of the COVID outbreak status of the facility and the patient had since received follow up with their provider and has a treatment plan. The medication in question has been clarified to the patient by the ordering provider. The OCO also contacted the patient to verify his resolution had been met and opened a new case as a result of this outreach.	No Violation of Policy
164.	External person reports incarcerated individual is being transferred and is in IMU because of a "spot on his lung" that was discovered at SCCC. Loved one called because she cannot get any information on his health and what is going to happen next. She reports the transfer was ordered by someone from the Center for Disease Control (CDC).	The OCO contacted health services and DOC confirmed the person was transferred and placed in a negative pressure room to rule out Tuberculosis. The Facility Medical Director reviewed the results with the OCO. DOC health services reported that they will discuss the results with the patient after they have conferred with the infectious disease specialist about the patient's future plan of care. The OCO provided information directly to the incarcerated patient. The OCO investigative record is confidential and does not provide medical records or information about an incarcerated patient's conditions to community members.	No Violation of Policy
165.	This person is requesting a medical recommendation for a single cell placement. Has a medical condition that causes him great embarrassment and distress.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy DOC 420.140 by DOC. The OCO reviewed the resolution responses and custody facility plan and found that the person's medical and mental health providers were consulted and the patient does not qualify for a single cell recommendation through those channels. This person is being housed safely at this time.	No Violation of Policy

Washington Corrections Center

166.	Incarcerated person reports staff misconduct during a disciplinary hearing. The staff member repeatedly mispronounced her name despite her calmly correcting the staff member. The staff member then accused this individual of defiant and disruptive behavior.	The OCO reviewed the hearing audio and confirmed the incarcerated individual's name was mispronounced multiple times. The OCO then contacted leadership at the Washington Corrections Center to discuss the hearing. Leadership at the facility confirmed they would discuss the concern with the staff member.	Assistance Provided
167.	The incarcerated individual reports that he put in a mental health emergency kite in August to see mental health and he still has not seen anyone. He reports that he has had several mental health emergencies and has not been seen by anyone after sending emergency kites and grievances.	The OCO provided assistance by contacting facility leadership and requesting a check-in by mental health. He was seen by mental health providers after the OCO outreach and the OCO was able to confirm that he has been seen multiple times in the past few months by mental health.	Assistance Provided
168.	Incarcerated individual reports that their original release date has passed and they are still incarcerated. The individual has housing they could be released to, but they need a release date to submit and the individual wants to know their release date.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO reviewed the incarcerated individual's Release Plan (ORP) and confirmed that the individual does have approved housing and a Planned Release Date (PRD).	DOC Resolved
169.	The incarcerated person raised concerns about their lack of release planning. The person was resentenced and contacted DOC records to inquire about their updated release date and received a response stating their Earned Release Date (ERD) has not yet been calculated. This person has not been assigned a unit counselor and is worried because other incarcerated individuals are dealing with the same issue.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO spoke to the individual who reported that their counselor had helped them and called someone at headquarters who explained the time calculations. The DOC reported that this individual's ERD is correct. His amended judgment and sentence vacated counts three and four. However, it changed count one from 12 months to 48 months, plus 12 months on the enhancement for 60 months run consecutively.	DOC Resolved
170.	The incarcerated individual reports that his property did not transfer when he moved facilities.	The OCO provided information regarding how the individual can file a Tort Claim if his property has been lost. The OCO also contacted property staff at the individual's first facility who confirmed that all of the individual's property that they had was shipped to his new facility, and property staff and the new facility confirmed that all property that was received had been given to the individual.	Information Provided
171.	Person is experiencing sleep deprivation and mental health issues because the lights in his unit are only off for five hours at night. Person says it would make a big difference if inmates were allowed to control the lighting system or allow lights to go off earlier in the night and later in the morning.	The OCO provided information regarding the R units. The individuals housed in the R units will not be provided light controls. The OCO encouraged the individual to reach out to mental health services if they continue to have issues with sleep.	Information Provided

172.	Incarcerated individual reports he was sentenced to 33 months, with all causes to run concurrently, per his J&S. He is still incarcerated and states he is serving 18 months that should have been counted already.	The OCO provided assistance by reviewed his sentencing structure and contacting his current counselor. The DOC records department recently changed his ERD to June 2022 and the counselor is working on his release planning. Per DOC Transition and Release 350.200 individuals requiring an approved release address may be held in confinement up to the Max Ex date until an approved release address is secured. This person's max date is currently November 2022.	Information Provided
173.	Incarcerated person states they did not receive a response to medical kites or grievances he submitted regarding obtaining needed medical equipment.	The OCO provided information regarding this person's resolution request. The OCO provided the process to obtain the medical equipment that the person had access to before entering DOC.	Information Provided
174.	Incarcerated individual reports that DOC is miscalculating his sentence by running the confinement portion of it consecutively rather than concurrently. The individual explains his Judgment and Sentence (J&S) has a space to indicate cause numbers that are to be run consecutively but they have been left blank, thus the confinement portion should be concurrent.	The OCO provided detailed information regarding the individual's sentence structure. The OCO reviewed the individual's Judgment and Sentences (J&S) and found that the original and first J&S orders one cause to be run concurrently to the to the conviction on this J&S. The individual has a new J&S that has not been ordered to run concurrently with the first J&S, therefore DOC will run the causes consecutively per RCW 9.94A.589(2)(a) which states "[w]henver 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." The OCO sent the individual detailed information about how to have the J&S re-heard including contact information for the county of conviction.	Information Provided
175.	The incarcerated individual reports that his unit often experiences a delay in mealtime. The individual also reports that his unit is not able to go to the gym or yard during their allotted time.	The OCO provided information regarding the facility's limited operations due to staff capacity. This office also confirmed that the individual has since transferred facilities.	Information Provided
176.	The incarcerated individual had a possession charge that was vacated but DOC is not changing their release date.	The OCO provided information regarding time calculation policy and application to this person's time calculation. The OCO contacted the DOC about this concern. The DOC reported that if a cause was vacated by the court, any sanction time is considered served	Information Provided

and will remain a part of the sentence calculations. In this case, the cause is running consecutively to the 30-day sanction, and the ERD will not change due to the vacated count.

177.	Incarcerated individual reports they are being denied their right to access the courts. The conditions of confinement in their current housing facility are prohibiting them from being able to access legal calls, restricting access to legal documents and because they are housed three to a two-person cell, they also cannot access the desk for writing. Incarcerated individual also reports they have been forced to end legal calls prematurely and they believe these are retaliatory actions by staff due to the nature of their lawsuits.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO reviewed the access the individual had to the courts and did not find access restrictions in violation of DOC policy. When housed at a DOC reception center, such as Washington Corrections Center (WCC), DOC does not allow individuals to possess documents with crime related information for their own safety. However, the legal mail officer walks the institution daily to address legal mail and allow individual access to documentation. While the individual was housed at WCC, they had access to law library two days a week as well as day room access, which is where individuals can make legal calls. Also, the individual is now at another facility, where they are allowed more legal access.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
178.	The incarcerated individual had appealed an infraction for a positive urinalysis and did not lose their good time for it. Recently they received a kiosk message saying that their earned release date (ERD) was changed and an extra 45 days was added for a previous infraction.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. This office made contact with the hearings officer to verify the information documented in this person's electronic file. This person received an infraction that was upheld after they appealed it. They were sanctioned to 45 days loss of good conduct time, and their new early release date reflects this change.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
179.	Incarcerated person states that while speaking with medical staff about his medication a DOC staff member said something disrespectful and told him he would not get a shower. Staff member allowed all others on the tiers to take showers with the exception of him and his cellmate.	The OCO reviewed the resolutions filed and verified they were administratively withdrawn and assigned for investigation by facility leadership. During the course of the investigation both incarcerated individuals and staff were interviewed as witnesses. None of the witnesses could corroborate the incarcerated individual's version of events nor could they confirm that the DOC staff member told the incarcerated individual he would not get a shower. Staff misconduct was unsubstantiated. However, it was substantiated that the incarcerated individual did not receive a shower on the day in question. Staff on the unit were reminded of the showering protocols. The incarcerated individual received copies of the response from DOC regarding the outcome of the investigations. Based on the witness statements, the OCO was unable to substantiate retaliation.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate

180.	The incarcerated individual reports that he filed grievances while in jail, but they were never responded to. The individual says that he asked for responses multiple times yet they were never received. The individual reports he has since been transferred to a prison facility.	The OCO lacks jurisdiction to investigate this complaint because the complaint relates to an action taken by an agency other than the Washington State Department of Corrections.	Lacked Jurisdiction
181.	The incarcerated person was found guilty of alleged violations while in community custody. The person was sanctioned as a community custody program return, leading them to miss their father's funeral. The person reports their 5th Amendment right to due process was violated and is challenging how the situation was handled.	The OCO lacks jurisdiction to investigate this complaint because the complaint does not involve a person committed to the physical custody of the DOC. The OCO determined that this person violated parole while they were in community custody, and the OCO does not have jurisdiction to look into concerns for individuals who are not in the physical custody of the DOC.	Lacked Jurisdiction
182.	A loved one submitted a concern regarding their extended family visit (EFV) denial with their husband. This person reports that their EFV denial is outside of policy.	The OCO could not identify evidence to substantiate a violation of policy by DOC. DOC policy 590.100 (10) says an individual with any documented history/indicator of domestic violence will be excluded from EFV privileges with the following: Persons with a like relationship to the individual as a victim (e.g., individuals who assaulted a spouse/state registered domestic partner, intimate partner) will be precluded from visits with a spouse or state registered domestic partner. The OCO determined that the incarcerated individual has previous domestic violence charges, which falls within DOC policy to deny extended family visits between he and his wife.	No Violation of Policy
183.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about the sanctions of a 603 infraction for introduction of drugs into the facility being very severe.	The OCO reviewed the sanctions for the infraction and found no violation of policy as the individual was given the mandatory sanctions for a 603 infraction.	No Violation of Policy
184.	Person states that the way DOC continues to move people around for COVID quarantine and isolation is causing the virus to continue to spread and keeps their unit constantly in quarantine, defeating the purpose.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC, due to COVID-19 protocols. The OCO was able to alert the Superintendent of the concern.	No Violation of Policy
185.	Incarcerated person raises concerns about devil worshipers having access to congregate in the facility's chapel. Person believes this to be a serious issue.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. Per the Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993, all religions are protected equally under the law. The members of the Church of Satan are equally eligible to use the chapel for their worship services by law and by policy.	No Violation of Policy
186.	The incarcerated individual is requesting that individuals in receiving units be allowed to order books to help with mental health	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. Per DOC 450.100, only newspaper	No Violation of Policy

	coping strategies and thus create a safer environment.	publications will be allowed for individuals housed in Reception Diagnostic Centers.	
187.	Incarcerated individual reports since arriving at the receiving facility person has consistently communicated with medical to be seen for medical conditions. Person says he was told he would be seen at a set appointment, however, the date came and went and he was not on the callout.	Individual left DOC custody prior to OCO involvement.	Person Left DOC Custody Prior to OCO Action
188.	Person says that they have several medical diagnoses that they have been treated for while incarcerated. When person was transferred to their current facility they did not have the necessary equipment or shoes available.	The OCO substantiated the patient's concerns of not having access to the durable medical equipment he had at a previous facility. The equipment this patient needs is affected by the nationwide computer chip shortage. The facility is waiting for approximately one dozen of these machines for patients and there is no estimate for when they will be available. DOC Health Services management also informed the OCO that the patient has been offered a temporary solution to the shoe issue while an outside appointment for medical shoes is made.	Substantiated Without Resolution
189.	Patient reports that staff opened a secure door and allowed another incarcerated individual to enter his cell and he was assaulted. The individual sustained a broken bone and other injuries which have not healed. There is an active grievance at level 3; level 2 said he was denied an orthopedic consultation. The individual says he was sitting on the toilet when this happened. It took medical 30+ days to see him and believes his hands have healed incorrectly.	The OCO was able to substantiate the patient's concern about delayed treatment, but was not able to achieve a resolution. The OCO reviewed the patient medical records and substantiated it took over a month for the patient to receive x-rays. The OCO confirmed DOC did consult with their orthopedic specialist, due to the advanced healed status of the fracture there were no treatment recommendations at that time.	Substantiated Without Resolution

Washington Corrections Center for Women

190.	The incarcerated individual reports that she is not fit to work in the kitchen due to a back injury. The individual has proof from Labor & Industries, but she reports the DOC does not care and continues to make her work in the kitchen. This individual is concerned that she will further injure her back working in the kitchen.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
191.	Patient reports ongoing issues with KOP medications not being refilled on time after submitting refill requests on time. At times this has left her without medications for several days. Person reports this has happened to her several times as well as other patients and may be a population concern at the facility.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued

192.	Patient reports being approved for gender affirming surgery two years ago but has not received a surgery consult.	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
193.	The incarcerated individual has been held in receiving for two months without mental health treatment or any programming options. This person has two open court cases and must repeat the receiving process delaying her ability to complete her mandatory treatment. This person also reports that while she was in receiving she missed three attorney visits because DOC did not supply her with a phone pin. This person has filed three resolution requests regarding these issues.	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 had filed her resolution requests on this matter very recently. DOC had not yet had time to respond to them.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
194.	Incarcerated individual states they have come across many issues with staff on the unit. They have submitted multiple resolution requests regarding verbal abuse by one specific staff member.	The OCO contacted facility leadership regarding this concern. The administration is working to resolve this issue by being more available in the unit and providing coaching for the staff member named in the complaint. This office could not locate a resolution request related to staff misconduct, and will remind the incarcerated individual to submit one if the issue is not resolved.	Assistance Provided
195.	The population reported that the phones were updated and the automated message is confusing and doesn't clarify how to contact the OCO. OCO staff tested the phones throughout WCCW and the automated prompt requires an individual to enter their PIN in order to complete the call. It is also unclear what call option people are supposed to select for OCO calls. People previously did not have to enter their PIN in order to dial the OCO hotline.	The OCO contacted the DOC HQ and facility level leadership to correct this issue. The OCO is still working with the DOC for a resolution. The OCO continues to visit the facility to gather concerns in person during this transition.	Assistance Provided
196.	The patient reports ongoing foot issues; the shoes she wears are causing pain. She said they cause numbness in her toe, her big toes bend under her foot, and she experiences twisting in her leg, ankle and upper foot. She reports DOC denied foot surgery and she bought specialized footwear herself, then the prison provided shoes and the person who measured her shoes was not a specialist, it was another incarcerated person. One foot is smaller than the other and she did not receive a professional fitting or specialized shoes. Later a doctor ordered	The OCO contacted health services to request they address the patient's medical concerns. DOC scheduled the patient and the OCO confirmed the appointment with her provider occurred and she was given treatment for foot-related ailments. DOC then submitted and approved a new referral for an orthopedic surgeon to reconsider surgical treatment options. DOC reports the patient will be scheduled for a consult at the surgeon's next availability. The OCO contacted the patient via interpreter services multiple times to provide and receive updates. Patient	Assistance Provided

	her shoes but they did not fit correctly. She was told DOC would customize her shoes and she has been waiting.	confirmed dental and foot issues are being addressed.	
197.	Patient contacted the OCO with updates on a previous medical case. Patient reports provider is not responsive to nonemergency concerns. Patient reports concerns regarding chronic back and hip pain. She has trialed treatments and expressed continued pain impacting sleep and posture. When OCO initially reached out, DOC reported improved conditions as of a December 2021 appointment, however, the patient reports continued need for medical attention for conditions. She is concerned there may be language barriers during medical appointments. She said DOC will not approve the back surgery and she would like an updated assessment and review for surgical consult. Patient also reports she was told she cannot access dentures because of a medication she takes.	The OCO contacted health services to address these concerns. DOC agreed to schedule the patient for an appointment to discuss back pain and treatment options. One medication was discontinued due to side effects and overlapping concerns with dental procedure and this was discussed with the patient. The patient is now scheduled for dental care and once complete she will see the denturist. The OCO contacted the patient several times to discuss updates.	Assistance Provided
198.	The incarcerated person reports that they were laid off from their job as a dog groomer for the prison Pet Partnership Program (PPP). Five weeks passed and this person was told they were laid off because of an ongoing PREA investigation between them and their boss. It has now been eight weeks and they still have not gone back to work and the PREA investigation has not been completed.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO contacted the DOC about the status of this person's job and the PREA investigation. The DOC reported that this person has returned to work, and the PREA investigation is ongoing. The OCO contacted the individual to verify their current employment position at the PPP. This office closed this concern and advised the individual to reach back out regarding the PREA investigation once it has been completed.	DOC Resolved
199.	The incarcerated individual reports that they tested positive for COVID at the camp last week, and were transferred because there was not a doctor on-site. The incarcerated individual reports that the doctor has returned to the camp and they want to go back today.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. This person was transferred back to their parent facility the next day.	DOC Resolved
200.	The incarcerated person reports that she had not been able to access the law library, which negatively impacted a lawsuit that was pending.	DOC staff resolved this concern before the OCO took action on this complaint. The OCO contacted the DOC about this concern. The DOC provided a detailed response about their communication with this incarcerated individual and how many times the individual was on the scheduled callout list. The DOC also reported that during the closure of the law library, staff went to the unit to assist this person with their request.	DOC Resolved

201.	Person has called several medical emergencies. She is experiencing a lot of pain. She would like for her blood to be drawn in order to see what is going on.	DOC staff resolved this complaint prior to OCO involvement. The OCO contacted Health Services management and were informed the patient has been seen by medical multiple times, has received a diagnosis from the FMD, and started treatment for her symptoms.	DOC Resolved
202.	External complainant says using COVID tests that are sent to an outside lab and take five days to come back with results is counterproductive. Complainant believes this is contrary to previously stated procedures which directs DOC to use methods that reduce the case numbers and health risk to incarcerated people. She says DOC should also not be housing sick people from MSU in segregation or two to a cell in segregation, but should instead open the gym again to improve conditions. The numbers the complainant was given only reflect those for MSU. They were told that for Minimum Security Campus (MSC), J Unit is being used for COVID cases and for the Close Custody Unit (CCU), East Pod is being used. The numbers within this institution alone should mandate urgent action and immediate change of procedure using rapid tests and opening of the gym for MSU population.	The OCO reviewed WA State DOC COVID-19 Screening, Testing, and Infection Control Guidelines Version 32 and contacted health services about testing practices during 2022 outbreak. WCCW uses rapid and PCR testing, and during facility outbreaks, follows the "Outbreak and Cluster Testing and Management" and "Population Testing and Cluster/Outbreak Resolution" sections of the guidelines. Roommates, with or without symptoms, are tested according to the unit testing schedule during outbreak status. The OCO substantiated crowded cells during early outbreak and found that DOC did reopen the gym in response. The OCO provided this information via letter as well as information regarding version 32 of the WA State DOC COVID-19 Screening, Testing, and Infection Control Guidelines.	Information Provided
203.	The population reported that a salad bar used to be available as an alternative and is no longer available. They do not have healthy options anymore.	The OCO spoke with the CPM and Food Services Manager. The facility has not offered a salad bar for over ten years. DOC claims it is unsanitary and creates high amounts of waste.	Information Provided
204.	The incarcerated individual reports that they filled out fundraising documentation to participate in a fundraiser. There was a mishap with the fundraiser and she was told her \$22 would be refunded. The individual reports that she has filed a grievance and sent kites but no one has been willing to speak with her or get the money refunded.	The OCO provided information about how to file a tort claim for her refund. The OCO contacted the DOC who reported that the reason she did not get a refund is because the money had already been deducted from her account and sent to the fundraiser.	Information Provided
205.	The incarcerated individual has been waiting to get into the Trades Related Apprenticeship Coaching (TRAC) program for close to three months. Her counselor explained that DOC facility staff are waiting for final approval from DOC headquarters to admit her into the program. She has concerns about being placed in a work release or Graduated Reentry (GRE) setting prior to her accessing the TRAC program. She also reports her Incoming Transport/Job	The OCO provided information regarding the incarcerated individuals status in the TRAC program. DOC informed the OCO that the individual has been approved for the TRAC program. The individual will be able to participate when COVID-19 restrictions lift. Currently, the facility where she is located is under facility wide COVID-19 outbreak status. The OCO also explained how to alert staff of the missing signature. The OCO	Information Provided

	Screening (ITJS) form was not signed by her classification counselor before she was moved from medium custody to minimum custody.	recommended filing a resolution request if DOC staff are unwilling to provide a signature.	
206.	Incarcerated person reports concerns with the lack of COVID rapid testing at the facility. Person says people have tested positive for COVID but medical will not test other individuals unless they are presenting symptoms and will not test individuals who were in contact with those who tested positive. Person does not believe this to be proactive on the facility's part to stop spread and are not being diligent about their safety.	The OCO reviewed WA State DOC COVID-19 Screening, Testing, and Infection Control Guidelines Version 32 and contacted health services about testing practices during 2022 outbreak. WCCW uses rapid and PCR testing, and during facility outbreaks, follows the "Outbreak and Cluster Testing and Management" and "Population Testing and Cluster/Outbreak Resolution" sections of the guidelines. Roommates, with or without symptoms, are tested according to the unit testing schedule during outbreak status. The OCO provided information regarding version 32 of the WA State DOC COVID-19 Screening, Testing, and Infection Control Guidelines.	Information Provided
207.	The incarcerated individual reports that their sentence has not been calculated correctly. The individual reached out to records at the facility, and staff reported that her earned release date was calculated correctly.	The OCO provided the incarcerated individual with contact information for DOC Headquarters. This office encouraged the individual to write a letter identifying what they think is incorrect with their sentencing calculations and forward their questions to the DOC Records office.	Information Provided
208.	The population reported that multiple people have account balances with GTL and have been given a toll free number to try to move the funds to the new phone system. The incarcerated people cannot dial toll free numbers and not everyone has someone on the outside to do the transfer for them.	The OCO lacks jurisdiction to investigate this complaint because the complaint relates to an action taken by an agency other than the Washington State Department of Corrections.	Lacked Jurisdiction
209.	The incarcerated individual reports that she is missing on stimulus check that was issued in 2021.	The OCO lacks jurisdiction to investigate this complaint because the complaint relates to an action taken by an agency other than the Washington State Department of Corrections.	Lacked Jurisdiction
210.	External individual reports an incarcerated individual is being placed into a Substance Abuse Recovery Unit treatment program by DOC, even though she does not have substance abuse treatment required on her Judgement and Sentence (J&S). The external individual reports that the individual's current placement is working great and movement into a different program may be a detriment to the individuals progress during her incarceration. The external individual reports the placement into Therapeutic Community (TC) came very suddenly, the	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. According to DOC 580.000 Substance Use Disorder Treatment Services, "Referrals for Substance Abuse Recovery Unit (SARU) treatment program services in Prisons may be accepted for individuals who have substance use disorder and determined to need services." Based on the individual's assessment, the need for services was identified and the individual was referred to SARU treatment services based on the assessment.	No Violation of Policy

individual did not know she was going to be placed into the program.

211.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about a 655 infraction for making alcohol. The individual states they did not commit this infraction and it is impacting their ability to continue on the graduated reentry (GRE) track.	The OCO reviewed the infraction and appeal packet as well as the hearing audio and evidence photos and find there is evidence to substantiate the 655 infraction for making alcohol as bread and fruit in various stages of fermentation were found in a bottle as well as eleven peanut butter containers in a trash bag on the individual's side of the cell. The individual also admitted in the infraction interview to making pruno, but did not specifically admit to making the pruno found in this cell search. The individual also expressed concerns about not having an attorney present during the infraction hearing, but there is no right to an attorney during these hearings, only a department advisor. The hearings officer advised the individual of this and the individual declined to have a department advisor present.	No Violation of Policy
212.	The incarcerated person reports that grievances are not being processed in a timely manner by resolution staff. This person mentioned that when timelines are not followed they feel their concerns are not considered valid or important.	The OCO was able to substantiate this concern, but was not able to achieve a resolution. The OCO contacted the DOC, who reported that there had been delays in processing grievances due to COVID and staffing shortages. The DOC reports they should be getting a second staff member to help process health services resolution requests.	Substantiated Without Resolution

Washington State Penitentiary

213.	The incarcerated individual reports that his tablet was locked in the dayroom and an officer picked it up. Shortly after, the individual was sent to the IMU. When he returned to his unit, he was told his tablet was missing and DOC staff at the facility claimed they did not know what happened to it.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
214.	The incarcerated individual reports that he put \$15 on an electronic hold, and the \$15 went missing from his account. This has happened twice, and a total of \$30 cannot be accounted for. He appealed this issue to the property room, and they said they could not find his property.	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
215.	External person reports their loved one is suffering from severe back pain and debilitating, radiating sciatic nerve pain due to ruptured discs, bone spurs, and degenerated discs. He is to the point that	The OCO contacted health services and the MAT Coordinator. DOC agreed to review the patient's medical records and eligibility for MAT and updated his treatment plan to include Suboxone treatment for concurrent	Assistance Provided

now he has difficulty walking, showering, and putting on his shoes. Before being incarcerated he had been on prescription pain management opiates for the several years due to severe spinal and nerve problems. He requested to be put on Suboxone at both Shelton during arrival and at WSP. After meeting with medical and following up via kites and grievances, DOC has refused to admit him into any kind of treatment program. Suboxone is a proven Medication-Assisted Treatment (MAT) solution to opiate addiction which also helps with nerve pain. His condition has markedly deteriorated since being incarcerated with Washington State DOC. He is also asking for an additional mattress for the pain.

chronic pain and Substance Use Disorder (SUD). The OCO provided information directly to the patient via letter. The OCO investigative record is confidential and we do not provide medical records or information about an incarcerated patient's conditions to community members. Mattresses can be addressed via the unit CUS.

216.	Incarcerated individual reports he is past his Earned Release Date (ERD) and is having problems setting up releasing planning with his Classification Counselor. The individual requests assistance in accessing time with his counselor to plan his release.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO verified DOC staff are working to have a release plan approved. The individual has been housed intermittently in the Close Observation Area (COA) which has made release planning challenging. There are community concerns in the location of the first release plan, so it was denied by the community custody officers of that county. Currently, there is a release plan built that is under review for final approval. The OCO ensured the individual had access to his Classification Counselor and continuously monitored the actions surrounding the individual's release planning including speaking with DOC staff about the status of the individual's release plan. The OCO verified that the current release plan appears to be a good option for the individual.	Assistance Provided
217.	Incarcerated individual reported he was in mental health crisis and wanted to be moved from the unit.	The OCO verified this individual was in the COA at the time of the call. This office contacted facility leadership who then performed a wellness check on this individual. He is being monitored by both medical and mental health. He has since been moved from the unit indicated in his concern.	Assistance Provided
218.	Incarcerated person reports that medical made an incorrect notation on a primary encounter report and would like DOC to fully review all related paperwork that contains the incorrect statement and correct or redact it.	The OCO contacted health services about this concern and confirmed the person is scheduled for reoccurring weekly records reviews. Medical records cannot be redacted or removed, however, patients can ask for amendments to be made. DOC agreed to discuss the specific record the patient is concerned about and update the relevant medical record with an amendment note if	Assistance Provided

confirmed with medical staff at the next scheduled records review.

219.	The incarcerated person reports that he is not supposed to be sent to a mainline institution. He told DOC his safety concerns. The person reports that he has medium points and does not need to be closed out. He was involved in a fight when he arrived at the new facility.	The OCO provided assistance by contacting DOC to inquire about this individual's current classification. DOC agreed to reclassify the incarcerated individual. Additionally, Intelligence and Investigations at the facility will contact him regarding his safety concerns.	Assistance Provided
220.	Person reports he has been taken in and out of the Intensive Management Unit and was sent to the hospital. He reports a delay in his care and emergency response. He is concerned there are still items inside him from where he swallowed part of a spoon. He was told it was in his colon and the doctor could not do anything about the issue. He has had continuing issues with bowel movements. He reported these problems to the nurses and doctor and was told he "will just have to live with it because that is what happens when you swallow something." He is concerned he needs medical attention and disagrees with DOC treatment. He feels DOC staff are not taking his medical concerns seriously.	The OCO contacted health services and DOC reports the patient received care after swallowing foreign objects and is scheduled for continued monitoring after swallowing additional items once returning to the facility. DOC reports the emergency room informed them that the original object had passed on its own prior to returning to the prison. Patient received a CT scan; x-rays are scheduled for continued monitoring.	Assistance Provided
221.	Incarcerated individual reports they have been having medical problems for the past year and half. They report they are unable to work due to these medical concerns. They state they were unassigned from work and then got an infraction due to missing work and was found guilty.	The OCO reviewed the infraction concern and contacted the medical provider who corroborated the individual's story about missing work due to medical conditions. The OCO then reached out to the facility who was unwilling to overturn the infraction. The OCO then contacted DOC headquarters about the infraction as hearings staff did not contact medical about the concerns during the investigation of the infraction and the medical concerns being substantiated by the provider. The infraction was then overturned and the sanctions were reversed.	Assistance Provided
222.	Incarcerated individual reports he suspects that the funds placed on hold for shipping incarcerated individuals' electronic property have been mishandled. The individual would like this systemic issue investigated.	The OCO has declined to review this concern. Per WAC 138-10-040: At a minimum, complaints should meet the requirements in RCW 43.06C.040 and be about an incarcerated individual; about an alleged department action; and made after the incarcerated individual has reasonably pursued resolution of the issue through the internal grievance, administrative, or appellate procedures with the department. The incarcerated individual has never opened a resolution request regarding this issue.	Declined

223.	Incarcerated individual reports their cable for television went out and it has not been restored yet. Individual reports this is only affecting the Intensive Management Unit (IMU).	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. DOC staff placed a work order to the facility engineers to resolve the issue. DOC staff explained to the OCO that this is an ongoing issue due to the physical plant of the facility, and staff are working to address the larger issue as well.	DOC Resolved
224.	An external person reports that DOC is allowing incarcerated individuals to watch the investigative discovery (ID) channel. They report this is unsafe because the television shows broadcasted on this channel detail crimes of people they may be incarcerated with, which may create an unsafe environment for these people.	The OCO provided information regarding why incarcerated individuals are allowed to watch the investigation discovery channel. Incarcerated individuals are allowed access to television, including channels that broadcast public information about a person's crime. The OCO spoke with DOC staff about this decision, and DOC informed the OCO that DOC is working to modify the mail policy to allow incarcerated individuals with more access to all types of materials that do not appear to be a direct safety concern. DOC will not remove the investigative discovery channel because they do not believe that public information about a person's crime is a direct safety issue. The OCO also verified that the person the caller was concerned about was in a protective custody setting.	Information Provided
225.	A loved one of the incarcerated individual reports that the individual is in quarantine after being exposed to someone with COVID-19. The loved one reports that the individual is in lockdown 23.5 hours per day, and was told that those in quarantine would get a TV to help with boredom. The loved one feels that the individual should have the TV that was promised because of the difficulty of being quarantined in a small room nearly all day.	The incarcerated individual returned to his regular unit soon after this concern was submitted. The OCO provided information on how to acquire a TV for use during quarantine should this occur again in the future.	Information Provided
226.	External friend or family member of an incarcerated individual reports DOC is not complying with the updated COVID-19 protocol published by DOC on May 26, 2022. The external friend or family member reports incarcerated individuals are not being afforded the right to opting out of moving to another unit to quarantine by signing a refusal waiver. They also report that incarcerated individuals testing COVID-19 positive and negative are required to quarantine and have been moved to different units to do so including the Intensive Management Unit (IMU).	The OCO provided information regarding the DOC updated COVID-19 protocol dated May 26, 2022. The OCO reviewed the updated COVID-19 protocol published by DOC on May 26, 2022 which states, "[i]t is recommended that individuals who are considered high-risk for severe COVID-19 (e.g. unvaccinated or co-morbid risk factor) individually quarantine, but can opt out of moving to another unit by signing a refusal form. Anyone else in the unit/work release can choose to individually quarantine upon request. The decision whether to individually quarantine or quarantine in a unit/work release cohort will follow an individual regardless of location	Information Provided

within prison/work release. However, an individual can opt to change their decision about how they want to quarantine at any time as per the clinical protocol." This refusal form does not allow an incarcerated individual to opt out of quarantine altogether if there are currently COVID-19 cases in close contact to them. The refusal form allows incarcerated individuals to choose to shelter in place or move to another unit to quarantine.

227.	The incarcerated individual reports that when he was moved to the IMU at the previous facility, he was told that his property would be moved to long term storage. He then moved to the IMU at another facility, and was told his property would move to long term storage there. When he moved to the living unit at his current facility, he did not receive all of his property, and DOC staff at his current facility told him they cannot locate it.	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 property staff at the facilities the individual was transferred to and requested that staff search for the individual's property, but the DOC was unable to locate it.	Information Provided
228.	Person has a traumatic brain injury and is afraid that if DOC will not put him in the bar units and or protective custody, he will be made fun of and possibly be put in danger if he is placed in general population.	The OCO provided information to the person regarding his most recently approved facility placement plan.	Information Provided
229.	The incarcerated individual reports that when he went to the IMU, he was told his property would be put in long term storage. When he returned to his unit, he notified the property room. The individual reports that it has been 12 days and he still has not received his property.	The OCO provided information regarding the large amount of property the facility is currently processing with a small number of DOC staff in the property room. This office explained that all property is processed in the order that it was received, and it may take time for his property to be processed given the current circumstances.	Information Provided
230.	The incarcerated individual reports that he was notified he did not have any funds on hold for the TV that was shipped between facilities. The person was also notified that the remainder of the fifteen dollars from the TV hold was used without notice or his consent to ship the remainder of his personal property.	The OCO contacted the DOC about this concern. The DOC reported that this person's property has not yet arrived, but when it does, they will get their TV. The DOC also mentioned that this person has plenty of funds available for his excess property shipment, which includes a TV, guitar, and several boxes.	Information Provided
231.	The incarcerated individual reports that last year DOC changed his Judgment and Sentence as well as his risk level. By changing those, the individual reports that he is unable to get housing and he is now having to max out on his sentence. The individual also says DOC refuses to enroll him in sex offender treatment which is court ordered	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The DOC cannot legally change a judgment and sentence. The individual's re-entry planning will not start until closer to his Earned Release Date (ERD).	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate

and will lower his risk score, making it more likely he can get approved for housing in the future.

232.	Incarcerated individual reports he cannot access a hair brush that meets his needs. The individual says that other incarcerated individuals who identify as transgender get access to more hairbrushes and he believes that all people should have access to hair brushes regardless of their gender.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO confirmed that all people, regardless of their gender, are able to purchase different types of hairbrushes on the commissary list.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
233.	Incarcerated individual reports he has filed two different resolution requests related to their own COVID-19 testing and a safety issue they wanted DOC to address. The individual reports he has not heard back from the resolution department on these requests and they are concerned that the resolution program at the facility is not responsive.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO reviewed resolution requests from 2020, 2021 and 2022 filed by the individual and found resolution requests addressing both issues. The OCO was not provided dates of when the individual filed the resolution requests, which would assist in assuring the resolution requests he's reporting were not responded to could be review further. The OCO shared this information with the individual.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
234.	The incarcerated individual reports that he was placed in administrative segregation pending an infraction that was later dismissed.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. Per DOC 320.200, individuals may be assigned to administrative segregation pending an investigation. The OCO confirmed that the infraction was dismissed and the individual has returned to their living unit.	No Violation of Policy
235.	The incarcerated person reports that they qualify for a single cell designation per policy. The person has had several roommates and does not want anything to happen that would cause harm to either party.	The OCO could not identify evidence to substantiate a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO determined that the DOC is following policy 420.140, which says that Headquarters MAX Custody Committee will review and approve single cell assignments for individuals who commit murder, aggravated assault resulting in life-threatening injuries as documented by a medical professional, or aggravated sexual assault. The DOC reported that this person did not meet the criteria for a single cell because their victim was not their cellmate.	No Violation of Policy
236.	Patient reports going to medication administration line and being denied medication.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of the health plan by DOC. The OCO contacted health services management and verified medical records. There is no history of that medication being ordered for this patient.	No Violation of Policy
237.	Incarcerated individual reports while housed at Washington State Penitentiary (WSP) he was assaulted and taken to the Intensive Management Unit (IMU) after the incident.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The DOC completed the individual's housing assignment in compliance with DOC	No Violation of Policy

	<p>DOC planned for him to transfer to another facility, however the individual reports fears of being placed in general population. The individual reports that he would rather go to a protective custody unit. DOC staff suggested he write a statement explaining his safety concerns and before he was able to meet with a staff member to discuss those concerns he was told to pack his property for transfer to WCC. The individual reports he refused to transfer and DOC told him he would be infraacted for refusing housing. The individual requests OCO assistance in ensuring he gets access to protection.</p>	<p>300.380 Classification and Custody Facility Plan Review. The OCO confirmed that DOC reviewed the individual's safety concerns and determined that placement at the new facility will not be a danger to the individual. The OCO also confirmed that the individual was not infraacted for refusing housing while in the IMU at WSP. The individual has not reported any safety concerns since they were transferred.</p>	
238.	<p>External individual reports incarcerated individual has Life Without Parole (LWOP) and usually is in a single man cell but has recently been in a two-person cell. He is struggling with having a cellmate and does not understand why the sudden change. External reporter states the incarcerated individual went through the proper channels inside DOC to try to resolve the issue and it was not addressed.</p>	<p>The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The DOC assessed this individual's need for a single cell in compliance with DOC 420.140 titled Cell/Room Assignment section III Single Cell Screening and Assessment. The individual was denied because they do not meet the requirements for a single cell.</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy</p>
239.	<p>The incarcerated individual reports that he was denied his application for GRE due to warrants and safety concerns. The individual says he does not understand the basis for the denial.</p>	<p>The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO found that the incarcerated individual currently has a misdemeanor detainer. Per DOC 390.590, individuals will not be allowed to participate in Graduated Reentry if they have a misdemeanor/felony detainer.</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy</p>
240.	<p>External person reports that he sent mail to two individuals and they tested false positive for drugs. Now his two friends are in segregation with pending infractions.</p>	<p>The OCO reviewed the infractions and information related to this incident. The DOC tested multiple items for multiple individuals that received mail from the external reporter which come up positive for drugs. The DOC also had evidence from monitoring phone calls between the individuals. The Incarcerated individuals will have the opportunity to appeal their infractions if they are found guilty. The DOC is within Administration Segregation policy 320.200 to hold the individuals in segregation pending a hearing. The incarcerated individuals named in this concern have not contacted this office.</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy</p>
241.	<p>Incarcerated individual reports that a staff member issued sanctions in the mental health infirmary that limit incarcerated individuals' access to the phone and time outside of their cells. The individual reports this is happening to them and other</p>	<p>The incarcerated individual advised the OCO they did not want the OCO to investigate the complaint.</p>	<p>Person Declined OCO Involvement</p>

individual on the mental health infirmary unit.

242.	External person reported DOC keeps changing their loved one's release date without cause.	The OCO verified the incarcerated individual's release date. He had a PRD set and has since released from custody.	Person Left DOC Custody Prior to OCO Action
243.	Incarcerated individual reports they have been trying to resolve several issues with the DOC resolution program but he is not receiving responses from the program. The individual has not been provided with the resolution request numbers, so they cannot appeal the resolution requests. The individual reports that the resolution program is past the timeframes to respond to resolution requests as outlined in the resolution manual. The long response times are making it difficult for the individual to resolve issues within the resolution program.	The OCO was able to substantiate this concern, but was not able to achieve a resolution. The OCO reviewed the individual's resolution requests and found that the resolution requests did receive a response. However, they were outside of the timeframes outlined in DOC's Resolution Program Manual. The OCO confirms that long wait times for resolution request responses is a concern statewide.	Substantiated Without Resolution
244.	The incarcerated individual reports that their facility cancels yard frequently. The individual filed a resolution request about this and appealed this to the highest level (level three) but DOC has not taken the issue seriously. The individual reports the importance of yard; that it boosts morale and the closure of yard times cultivates feelings of resentment and depression in the incarcerated individuals affected.	The OCO was able to substantiate this concern, but was not able to achieve a resolution. The OCO was able to confirm that yard times have been canceled at Washington State Penitentiary (WSP) and at facilities all over the state due to staffing shortages at the facilities.	Substantiated Without Resolution

Abbreviations & Glossary

ADA: Americans with Disabilities Act

AHCC: Airway Heights Corrections Center

ASR: Accommodation Status Report

BOE: Behavioral Observation Entry

CBCC: Clallam Bay Corrections Center

CCCC: Cedar Creek Corrections Center

CI: Correctional Industries

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

CO: Correctional Officer

CRC: Care Review Committee

CRCC: Coyote Ridge Corrections Center

CUS: Correctional Unit Supervisor

DES: Department of Enterprise Services

DOSA: Drug Offender Sentencing Alternative

EFV: Extended Family Visit

ERD: Earned Release Date

GRE: Graduated Reentry

HCSC: Headquarters Community Screening Committee

HSR: Health Status Report

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