

CASE INVESTIGATIONS: 181

Assistance Provided: 35
Information Provided: 73
DOC Resolved: 20
Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate: 12
No Violation of Policy: 35
Substantiated: 6

INTAKE INVESTIGATIONS: 31

Administrative Remedies Not Pursued: 8
Declined: 17
Lacked Jurisdiction: 0
Person Declined OCO Involvement: 6
Person Left DOC Custody Prior to OCO Action: 0

Resolved Investigations: **212**

Assistance or Information Provided in
60%
of Case Investigations

OCO CASEWORK HIGHLIGHTS

September 2023

Assistance Provided

Reported Concern: External person reported that their loved one's mental health has been deteriorating since they have been in solitary confinement. This has been going on for two years.

OCO Actions: The OCO conducted an in-person visit with the individual. This office was able to verify that he was not engaging with OCO staff. The OCO contacted the Superintendent and asked that a mental health assessment be conducted for this person.

Negotiated Outcomes: DOC agreed to conduct the assessment. After a review by mental health staff, this individual was approved for a Residential Treatment Unit.

Assistance Provided

Reported Concern: Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about needing assistance writing an infraction appeal.

OCO Actions: The OCO contacted DOC and requested that the individual be provided with assistance with writing the infraction appeal.

Negotiated Outcome: DOC agreed to provide the requested assistance.

Assistance Provided

Reported Concerns: Patient reported that he had been issued medical equipment by a specialist, which was later removed from his possession by custody staff.

OCO Actions: The OCO provided assistance by contacting Health Services Management and requesting the device be located. The OCO also requested that DOC create a plan for ensuring the device could be used effectively.

Negotiated Outcome: DOC agreed to the OCO's request.

Assistance Provided

Reported Concerns: Individual reported he had been housed in long-term isolation due to involuntary protective custody. He stated that he would like to return to general population.

OCO Actions: The OCO reviewed this concern and contacted DOC headquarters staff regarding his placement.

Negotiated Outcomes: DOC agreed to prepare a new custody facility plan and a custody promotion. DOC then moved the person to general population.

Assistance Provided

Reported Concerns: During an in-person visit to WSP, multiple individuals expressed concerns to OCO staff related to phone time. They reported that the phones turn off at 9pm, but Securus allows them to stay on until 11pm. WSP is the only facility that turns the phones off at 9pm.

OCO Actions: The OCO verified that the phones at WSP turn off at 9pm whereas the phones at other facilities are open until 11pm. This office contacted facility leadership and DOC headquarters leadership to negotiate a change in the phone times to align with other facilities.

Negotiated Outcome: The DOC agreed to allow access until 11pm.

Assistance Provided

Reported Concerns: Patient reported medical needs and requested Extraordinary Medical Placement (EMP) or compassionate release.

OCO Actions: The OCO provided assistance by contacting DOC health services and alerting headquarters leadership.

Negotiated Outcomes: After OCO outreach, the person was approved for transfer to Sage Unit due to their medical needs. Additionally, the EMP Coordinator confirmed that the patient's review is in progress.

Monthly Outcome Report: September 2023

COMPLAINT SUMMARY

OUTCOME SUMMARY

CASE CLOSURE
REASON

CASE INVESTIGATIONS

Airway Heights Corrections Center

- | | | |
|---|--|------------------------|
| 1. Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about not receiving a response to their infraction appeal. | The OCO reached out to DOC and confirmed the infraction appeal was not received, but upon OCO request, DOC agreed to accept a rewritten infraction appeal despite being outside the timeframes. | Assistance
Provided |
| 2. Patient reported concerns about nursing administration of hormone injections. | The OCO provided assistance. This office contacted health services to request resolution of this concern. Arm injections are not medically recommended by the specialist and the patient can receive the shot in either their glute or thigh. They can communicate preferences to the nursing staff. After OCO outreach, DOC health services agreed to remind nursing staff of the approved injection protocols. The individual was encouraged to follow up if they have continued concerns. | Assistance
Provided |
| 3. Person reported he found a Securus hotline number for incarcerated individuals in a memo from the associate superintendent, 855-373-7292. Person stated the number is blocked and incarcerated individuals cannot call this number. | The OCO provided information. The OCO confirmed that this number was listed on Securus' website as a hotline for incarcerated individuals. The OCO reached out to DOC Headquarters, who investigated and found that this hotline is for individuals who have been released who are seeking refunds, not for currently incarcerated individuals. The OCO made DOC Headquarters aware that this number is being shared at facilities as a hotline for the incarcerated. The OCO reached out to the facility, who could not confirm that such a memo went out but were able to confirm that all staff are aware of the proper protocol for incarcerated individuals to reach out to Securus. The facility said that incarcerated individuals can contact Securus via kiosk for hardware issues and help tickets for all other Securus concerns. | Assistance
Provided |
| 4. The individual reports that he was denied Extended Family Visits (EFVs) with his wife based on inaccurate information. The individual reports that he was denied EFVs due to having domestic violence (DV) indicators with a like victim, but feels that the | The OCO provided assistance. This office reviewed the individual's denial of EFVs with DOC HQ staff and verified that he was denied per DOC 590.100, Extended Family Visits, which states that an individual with any documented history indicator of domestic violence will be excluded from EFV privileges with persons of a like relationship to the individual as a victim. Per policy, individuals may | Assistance
Provided |

DOC is denying him EFVs out of malice.

also be denied based on the nature of the crime, criminal history, and current/prior behavior. The OCO spoke with DOC staff who report that the individual was denied due to multiple factors. Upon discussion between OCO and DOC staff, if the individual is able to provide full documentation regarding the DV indicator, DOC HQ would be willing to review his application again.

5.	External person reports that their loved one has a chronic condition that causes flare ups. The patient had notified medical of the medication that was prescribed to the patient in the community. The caller is requesting the patient be seen by a specialist to get this medication. The person also requested assistance with getting the patient a low bunk Health Status Report.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. OCO staff contacted Health Services management who confirmed the patient is receiving the requested medication and has been out to the specialist in the community with follow up appointments scheduled. The request for a low bunk Health Status Report was reviewed by multiple medical providers, including the Facility Medical Director and was denied due to not meeting criteria.	DOC Resolved
6.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about their custody level and facility placement.	The OCO reviewed this concern and confirmed that DOC resolved both of the individual's concerns prior to OCO involvement.	DOC Resolved
7.	Person reported that it has been over a year since he first filed a resolution request about receiving a new mattress and was told that DOC was facing material shortages that were delaying production. Person stated he still has not received a new mattress.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO reached out to the Correctional Program Manager at the facility, who confirmed that new mattresses have been distributed to all living units at the facility.	DOC Resolved
8.	A loved one of the incarcerated individual reports that they should be allowed visits with their loved one, but has not been able to visit him.	The OCO provided information regarding the process for visitor applications. This office reviewed the individual's visit applications and could not find an application for the loved one who reported this concern. The loved one must fill out and submit DOC 20-060, Visitor Application, along with all required documents through the DOC website. The individual and their loved one may also review DOC 450.300, Visits for Incarcerated Individuals, to find more information on visitation requirements and processes.	Information Provided
9.	External person reports an incarcerated individual was injured and needed surgery. The patient was ordered medications from the surgeon and has not received them.	The OCO provided information to the patient regarding the process DOC staff must follow to order medication recommended by specialists. DOC providers have to verify that a recommended treatment is covered by the DOC Health Plan and pharmacy formulary prior to ordering. If a medication is non formulary it must go through a	Information Provided

formulary exception review to be provided to the patient.

10.	A loved one of the incarcerated individual reports that the individual has safety concerns at several facilities. The loved one reports that the individual requested Safe Harbor but was told he would be going to general population where he fears for his safety.	The OCO provided information. This office reviewed the individual's Custody Facility Plan (CFP) and found that it was completed per DOC 300.380, Custody and Facility Plan Review, and the individual's safety concerns were validated and considered for his facility placement. The individual was transferred to a different facility, and he received a custody promotion and will be able to complete programming.	Information Provided
11.	The individual reports safety concerns in general population at his facility.	The OCO provided information. This office reviewed the individual's Custody Facility Plan (CFP) and found that the DOC planned to move him to a different facility. This office verified that the individual has since transferred.	Information Provided
12.	Incarcerated individual reports safety concerns in the unit he is currently housed.	The OCO provided information. The OCO reviewed the concerns and the actions taken by DOC to mitigate the individual's safety concern. The OCO found DOC was unable to verify the safety concerns. The OCO provided the individual with information about what DOC considers a safety concern and how to properly report them.	Information Provided
13.	The individual says that he believes he was wrongfully denied the Community Parenting Alternative (CPA) program. The person says that his substance use assessment put a hold on him, but he feels that the DOC is abusing their power by requiring him to complete programs that he has already completed. The individual reports that the denial is hindering his chance at successful reentry and being able to provide for his family.	The OCO provided information. This office spoke with DOC staff in charge of the CPA program who verified that the individual received an administrative denial due to suitability based on what occurred during his current conviction and other high-risk behaviors with minors. The OCO confirmed that the individual is currently participating in another partial confinement program.	Information Provided
14.	The individual reports that he has three resolution requests which have not been responded to. The individual says that they are all connected. The individual has tried to work with the resolutions department but still has not received responses.	The OCO provided information. This office reviewed all the individual's resolution requests and found that they have been responded to. The OCO is working to compile examples of concerns regarding resolution requests to be in conversation with resolutions at DOC HQ.	Information Provided
15.	Person reports they were injured and DOC medical did nothing to address the injury.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. OCO staff contacted Health Services management and were given a detailed explanation of the care provided to the patient for the injury reported. OCO staff verified this information through record review.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate

16.	The individual reports that DOC denied him and his loved one Extended Family Visits (EFVs). The individual reports he was denied due to being deemed not amenable to mandatory programming based on his conviction. The individual reports that he and his loved one appealed the denial and it was upheld.	The OCO was unable to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. Per DOC 590.100, Extended Family Visiting, Individuals with a sex offense listed in Attachment 2 will only be eligible for an EFV if screened through the required programming and approved by the EFV Review Committee. Programming unit employees/staff must determine the individual as amenable to the required programming and the individual must participate when eligible. The individual was found to be not amenable to the required programming. The DOC does not have jurisdiction over the individual's charges or conviction.	No Violation of Policy
-----	---	--	------------------------

17.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about placement in segregation.	The OCO reviewed the individual's placement in segregation and found it was due to the individual being a safety threat to the institution, thus, the placement was not a violation of DOC 320.200.	No Violation of Policy
-----	--	---	------------------------

Cedar Creek Corrections Center

18.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about an infraction they received.	The OCO reviewed the infraction narrative but was unable to locate evidence to substantiate the individual's account of the event.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
-----	---	--	---------------------------------------

19.	An external person reports that the incarcerated individual is in the Intensive Management Unit (IMU) for an infraction for refusing search. The external person reports that the DOC violated search policy.	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy by the DOC. This office reviewed the infraction and did not find a violation of DOC 420.310, Searches of Incarcerated Individuals, or DOC 460.000, Disciplinary Process for Prisons. The DOC is unwilling to overturn this infraction. This office verified that the individual is no longer in the IMU.	No Violation of Policy
-----	---	---	------------------------

20.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about infraction sanctions they received.	The OCO reviewed the sanctions and found no violation of DOC policy as they all included the mandatory sanctions for the infraction violation.	No Violation of Policy
-----	--	--	------------------------

Clallam Bay Corrections Center

21.	Person reported that legal mail from a prosecutor was rejected, and that he needs the documents to file a motion. Person said he was told the rejection was being reviewed by DOC Headquarters, but he has not heard from them in months, and want to be sure they are reviewing the rejected legal mail.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO reviewed the rejected mail and upon review, found that the appeal information and description of the document from DOC Headquarters did not match the contents of the document. The OCO spoke with DOC Headquarters, who acknowledged that a mistake was made, and that they would communicate with this individual what happened and why the mail was rejected, as well as speak with the facility mailroom to ensure similar mistakes do not happen in the future. DOC Headquarters decided to maintain the rejection of the document, because it was sensitive information related to his conviction.	Assistance Provided
-----	---	---	---------------------

22.	An anonymous individual reported that seven close custody individuals with a history of STG	The OCO contacted the facility and confirmed that the facility is investigating the concern. This office	Information Provided
-----	---	--	----------------------

	found metal (paperclips, staples) in their food. Concerned about potential bad actors in kitchen who are aware these individuals have dropped from their STG.	verified individuals from general population do not have access to the D unit food.	
23.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about retaliation.	To substantiate retaliation, the OCO must be able to prove that a negative action from a DOC staff member is not only linked close in time to an incarcerated individual's protected action but there must be evidence of a clear relationship between the two acts. The OCO was unable to locate evidence to substantiate this claim.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
24.	The individual reports that he was in the hospital and was told he would return to his previous facility, but was then transferred to another facility. The individual was placed in administrative segregation pending transfer and has remained there since.	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy by DOC. This office reviewed the individual's placement and found that he was returned to general population shortly after this concern was reported. The OCO found that the individual was then placed in administrative segregation again pending the investigation of an infraction per DOC 320.200, Administrative Segregation.	No Violation of Policy
25.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about receiving an infraction despite having an HSR for said concern.	The OCO reached out to DOC the day the concern was brought to the office's attention and inquired if the infraction could be dismissed as the individual has an HSR. DOC required the individual to attend the infraction hearing, at which point, the infraction was dismissed.	Assistance Provided
26.	Person reported that staff confiscated a religious garment and harassed him as he tried to explain the religious significance of the garment and described feeling scared and embarrassed by the interaction. Person stated that the garment was multicolored and did not break any rules.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO reviewed his resolutions request investigation and spoke with the religious coordinator at the facility, and the OCO confirmed that the garment was not allowed per policy and not on his property matrix. The religious coordinator confirmed that he provided a new religious garment to this individual. The OCO reached out to the Correctional Program Manager regarding training materials being sent out about this issue. Upon the OCO's request, the religious coordinator sent out training materials and an email describing the proper protocol for handling religious items.	Assistance Provided
27.	External person reports that their loved one was injured in the gym. It took a long time for the patient to get to the emergency room and the facility did not have the proper equipment to stabilize his injury. This person states that the patient was told he needed to have surgery within a week.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. OCO staff reviewed records and found the surgery had already been completed.	DOC Resolved
28.	Person reported that the outcome from a previous OCO case has not	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO reached	DOC Resolved

been resolved, and that he has not received the medical shoes he was told he would receive.

out to the Resolutions Specialist, to his counselor, and to the Health Services Manager and confirmed that he did receive his medical shoes and reported that they fit well and that he was happy with them.

29.	Person reports he was on a medication prior to incarceration and his current provider is requiring him to try different medications.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to OCO involvement. OCO staff contacted Health Services management and were informed the patient is receiving the same medication they requested, in an alternative dose form. The patient must work with their provider if the delivery method of the medication needs to be changed.	DOC Resolved
30.	A loved one reported that an incarcerated individual requested protective custody after experiencing safety concerns. She also reported that he would be transferred to a new facility, and expressed concern that he might have safety issues at this new facility. This individual also called and described his safety concerns.	The OCO provided information. The OCO reviewed DOC records and found that he had been transferred to a different facility. The OCO provided information about how to report safety concerns if new issues arise at this facility.	Information Provided
31.	Patient reports delayed surgery and a separate specialist consult. Person reports being taken to the wrong doctor.	The OCO provided information about the patient's next steps in treatment planning, including cardiology clearance pre-surgery. This office also reviewed for any appointment mix ups and could not identify evidence to substantiate the patient was taken to the wrong doctor. The OCO shared more details with the patient.	Information Provided
32.	Person reports that their work schedule conflicts with the times that Health Services schedules supplies pick up. He is requesting his pick up appointment be changed so he does not have to miss any work.	The OCO provided information to the patient regarding his request for medical to accommodate his work schedule. Medical staff are not able to accommodate this request. Work supervisors are required to allow workers to attend mandatory medical call outs. Medical cannot accommodate every person's work schedule and for that reason cannot make an exception for one person. Leaving work for a mandatory call out does not impact an individual's work performance evaluations.	Information Provided
33.	Incarcerated individual expressed a desire to have their infraction narrative modified after part of the infraction was dismissed.	The OCO reached out to DOC about this concern who stated the infraction narrative cannot be modified as it has been entered into the individual's official record.	Information Provided
34.	Incarcerated individual reports concerns about how the units at the facility are being managed. The individual reports DOC is managing the unit as a close custody when the unit is medium custody.	The OCO provided information about DOC's security management decision for CRCC. The OCO reviewed a memo from the Associate Superintendent that was provided to the population that explains the "split rack" process is needed in order to better monitor behavior following certain incidents. DOC and the OCO did	Information Provided

not find any violations of RCWs or WACs that prohibit such practice.

35.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about rescission of their HSR.	The OCO contacted DOC about this concern and informed the individual of the process to get the HSR reissued.	Information Provided
36.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about being told they were not allowed to appeal an infraction.	The OCO reviewed the infraction and informed the individual that they are allowed to appeal the infraction. The OCO also reviewed the infraction and found no violation of policy.	Information Provided
37.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about an infraction they received in which their cellmate claimed possession of contraband but they were still found guilty.	The OCO reviewed the infraction packet and asked DOC if they would be willing to dismiss the infraction as there is evidence the cellmate did claim possession which would show a satisfaction of the WAC 137-96-100 requirement that an individual provide evidence to show a lack of involvement in a cell-tag infraction, however, DOC was unwilling to dismiss the infraction as the cellmate did not claim possession until over a week after the contraband was located.	No Violation of Policy
38.	The individual reports that he has been in segregation for an investigation. The individual reports that he was not infractioned but is still in segregation and it is affecting his programming.	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy by DOC. This office reviewed the individual's placement in administrative segregation and found he was placed per DOC 320.200, Administrative Segregation. The OCO verified that the individual has returned to general population.	No Violation of Policy
39.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about an infraction they received.	The OCO reviewed the infraction narrative and found the individual's behavior met the infraction elements per DOC 460.000	No Violation of Policy
40.	Patient states that he received a hearing test that indicated he needed two hearing aids. The request for a second hearing aid was denied by DOC medical. The patient attempted to grieve the issue and was told he did not meet criteria.	The OCO was unable to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The Patient Health Plan only covers a single hearing aid unless specific criteria are met. Per the Health services protocol referenced in the Patient Health plan, Binaural hearing aids can be considered for the following special populations: 1) those younger than 21 years of age, 2) Those who have corrected vision loss of 20/200 or greater; or Those who have other sensory deprivation disorders, i.e autism spectrum or sensory processing disorder. Patients who do not fall into at least one of these categories but want binaural hearing aids may purchase a second hearing aid through the Patient Paid Healthcare process.	No Violation of Policy
41.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about an infraction they received.	The OCO reviewed the infraction and contacted DOC to see if they would be willing to overturn the infraction, however, DOC declined to overturn the infraction as the evidentiary standard was met.	No Violation of Policy

Larch Corrections Center

42.	External person reports that an individual is being held in solitary confinement and infractioned for refusing housing. He refused housing because he did not feel that he was safe at the new location due to his crime.	The OCO contacted the facility and DOC HQ regarding his infractions and transfer. The infractions are no longer on his record and he has been transferred to a different camp.	Assistance Provided
43.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about their UA sample not being sent to the lab.	The OCO reviewed the individual's infraction record and found the UA sample was sent to the lab.	DOC Resolved
44.	Individual reports the DOC is attempting to transfer him when he still has programming to complete.	The OCO was able to verify that he has a hold in the system for programming.	DOC Resolved

Mission Creek Corrections Center for Women

45.	Person reports she developed a skin condition and has been treated by medical but the treatment is not effective. The patient is requesting specific testing and an appointment with a specialist in the community before her release.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. OCO staff reviewed records and found that there is not sufficient time to get the patient into a specialist clinic before release. The DOC reentry nurse will set a primary care appointment for the patient to attend upon release to get the necessary referral to move forward with care.	DOC Resolved
46.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about an infraction they received.	The OCO was unable to locate a violation of DOC policy. The OCO reviewed the infraction and found the behavior met the infraction elements per DOC 460.000	No Violation of Policy

Monroe Correctional Complex

47.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about needing assistance writing an infraction appeal.	The OCO contacted DOC and requested that the individual be provided with assistance with writing the infraction appeal. DOC then confirmed the individual was provided said assistance.	Assistance Provided
48.	Incarcerated person reports that he has asked for protective custody to allow people in A, B and C units to opt out of prison politics while allowing people in protective custody to retain their access to amenities that are not allowed in solitary confinement.	The OCO met with this individual in person at the facility. He confirmed that this was a recommendation and not a complaint. This office verified that this individual is currently living in general population and not solitary confinement.	Assistance Provided
49.	Person reports he has been in solitary confinement a long time waiting for transfer. He reports this is causing his mental health to deteriorate. He reports he has not been seen by his provider in over 10 weeks and five or six weeks	The OCO contacted the DOC classifications to find out why this individual had been housed in Solitary Confinement for so long. The DOC reported that due to limited placement options they were still working on his Transfer. The OCO requested for the individual to be moved immediately. He has now been placed in the	Assistance Provided

	since being seen by a MH provider.	transfer plan with an approved transfer to a facility.	
50.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about needing assistance writing an infraction appeal.	As a follow-up to previous OCO outreach regarding this concern, OCO confirmed that as a result of said previous request, DOC aided the individual in writing an infraction appeal.	Assistance Provided
51.	Patient reports that DOC staff keep giving him plastic items against his conditions of confinement and due to impulse control issues, he uses the items to self harm. The individual asked that the OCO substantiate this has occurred more than five times.	The OCO provided assistance by elevating the concern to the Health Service Administrator and asking for resolution. The OCO substantiated the individual was given plastic items outside of his conditions of confinement multiple times; the individual used the items to self-harm and was placed in the Close Observation Area (COA). After OCO outreach, DOC agreed the COA is not suitable for long term housing and the conditions of confinement should be met in the person's regular housing assignment. Health services and custody staff worked together to develop a plan to mitigate the issue; a supervisor will be present during meal handouts to identify and prevent patient from receiving plastics. The OCO provided the individual with information and encouraged follow up if the issues continue.	Assistance Provided
52.	Person reported that his Earned Release Date (ERD) has been miscalculated because of an error on his Judgment and Sentencing (J&S) and that his current sentence exceeds the statutory maximum allowed in his case.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO reviewed his resolution request investigation and saw that his concern was substantiated at the facility level, confirming that the total term for one of the counts does not match was ordered on the J&S, and that the facility reached out to the courts requesting a hearing to modify the J&S. The OCO reached out to the facility records supervisor, who confirmed that the courts have not gotten back to them and that they spoke to this individual about the situation. Upon the OCO's request, they reached out to the courts again requesting a hearing. This office provided information about writing to DOC Records at Headquarters if this issue continues.	Assistance Provided
53.	Person reports he was moved out of his ADA cell without reason. He has serious mobility issues and cannot function in a non-ADA cell.	The OCO provided assistance by contacted Health Services management and the ADA coordinator. DOC staff confirmed the person would be moved back into an ADA cell within the same day.	Assistance Provided
54.	Patient reports contacting DOC about beginning Medication Assisted Treatment (MAT) programming since he is close to his release date but has not heard back.	The OCO contacted health services and confirmed the patient was already on the MAT list. After OCO outreach, the patient was scheduled prior to release date to discuss MAT medication options. The OCO added this case to our appointment tracker and confirmed the appointment was scheduled and occurred, followed by additional healthcare encounters.	Assistance Provided

55.	Patient reports delayed access to medical care for a list of symptoms.	The OCO provided assistance by contacting DOC health services and requesting resolution. This office confirmed an appointment was scheduled and the patient was referred to GI specialist for testing, which was authorized. The OCO added this case to our appointment tracker to confirm appointment scheduling and occurrence. DOC reports not all symptoms were reported by the patient to their provider and the OCO shared information about patient's next steps.	Assistance Provided
56.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about not hearing back on their infraction appeal.	The OCO contacted DOC who confirmed they never received the appeal but upon OCO request they agreed to accept a resubmitted appeal.	Assistance Provided
57.	External person reports that their loved one is elderly and has been held in solitary confinement since he entered the prison system.	The OCO reviewed this individual's custody facility plan and verified he was being held in solitary confinement on a medical hold. Due to his crime of conviction, he was classified in close custody, however he had medical needs which placed him in a prison that did not have his custody level. The OCO contacted HQ classifications, medical and the facility to request a move to a lower custody or to a different facility. The individual was eventually moved, however the OCO recommended the DOC create a better review process for medical holds. The DOC agreed to the recommendation. The DOC has also created a new protocol to review custody placement for all individuals over the age of 60.	Assistance Provided
58.	Patient reports she is in pain and is supposed to have surgery.	DOC Staff resolved this concern before OCO involvement. OCO staff reviewed the patient electronic records and found the patient had the surgery.	DOC Resolved
59.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about an infraction they received.	The OCO reviewed the concern and confirmed that DOC dismissed the infraction.	DOC Resolved
60.	Person reported that he heard at a family council meeting that workers' pay would be raised to \$100 per month, but now DOC is saying only some jobs will receive a pay increase and will be capped at \$55 per month.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. This individual called the OCO and said that DOC resolved this issue. The OCO reviewed a memo from Secretary Strange regarding Class 2 and 3 compensation, which stated compensation will not exceed \$100 and that the new lowest pay rate was \$1 per hour (with the exception of \$.80 per hour as the probationary rate).	DOC Resolved
61.	A loved one of the incarcerated individual reports that she tried to submit an application to visit the individual but was unable to complete the application due to not having a passport. The loved one reports that they are a US	The OCO provided information regarding how the individual's loved one can complete the visitation application. This office spoke with DOC HQ staff and found that when a person applies for visitation using DOC 20-060, Visitor Application, they must choose either US Citizen or Non-US Citizen. These choices do not take into account	Information Provided

resident and have a driver license but the visitation application would not accept a driver license.

people who may be residents but not citizens of the US. DOC staff confirmed that if someone is a US resident, they may mark the box for “US Citizen”, complete the application, and make a note in the comments that they have provided a copy of their driver license. The Non-US Citizen application is typically for individuals who do not reside in the US or have any US identification such as a driver license.

62.	The individual reports that in the middle of the night officers walk by his cell with a bright flashlight and point it at him which disturbs his sleep. The individual also reports issues with the lock on his cell and has concerns that other incarcerated individuals are able to enter his cell. The individual also reports that he is unable to file resolution requests.	The OCO provided information. The OCO reviewed the individual’s resolutions requests and found that he has not filed one regarding this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process. The OCO verified that while the individual was previously infracted for abuse by quantity of resolution request submitted, he is not restricted from utilizing the resolution program. This office also confirmed that the individual has since moved to another unit.	Information Provided
-----	--	---	----------------------

63.	Person reported that a Securus staff told him about a hotline for incarcerated individuals to use for customer support, but that DOC is blocking this number.	The OCO provided information. The OCO reached out to DOC Headquarters, who confirmed that this number is a Securus customer service hotline for friends and family, but not for the incarcerated. DOC has confirmed that there are no customer service hotlines for incarcerated individuals, and the only way for incarcerated individuals to contact Securus is through the help ticket system or by mail. The OCO is actively monitoring the transition to Securus and is still gathering information. The OCO does not have jurisdiction over Securus but is in discussion with DOC regarding their contract with Securus and is bringing issues and concerns from incarcerated individuals to DOC’s attention.	Information Provided
-----	---	---	----------------------

64.	Incarcerated individual reports concerns regarding an infraction sanction that was reduced after OCO involvement. The individual states DOC agreed to reduce the amount of Good Conduct Time (GCT) and has not completed that action.	The OCO provided information regarding the infraction sanction reduction. The OCO found the original case was reviewed by the OCO in 2021. The agreement between DOC and OCO was to remove the individual’s sanction of 20 days loss of store, which was removed. The OCO was unable to locate evidence to support DOC agreed to restore GCT time for the individual.	Information Provided
-----	---	---	----------------------

65.	The individual reports that staff in their unit are announcing when people are on the call out for mental health. The individual reports that typically staff would tell people in private why they are	The OCO provided information regarding how individuals can report this issue if it continues to occur. This office spoke with DOC staff at the facility who report that they were made aware of this concern via an anonymous kite, but were unable to verify that this occurred. The	Information Provided
-----	---	---	----------------------

	on the call out and not announce the reason for others to hear. The person says that since this has occurred, individuals who see mental health have been ridiculed, and some people have cancelled their mental health appointments.	Correctional Unit Supervisor (CUS) spoke with unit staff upon receipt of the kite to ensure this was not occurring. If this concern should arise again, DOC staff encourage individuals to contact the sergeant or CUS with specific information about the incident including dates and times. DOC staff would then be able to review the occurrence and correct staff if needed.	
66.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about a urinary analysis (UA) that was conducted.	The OCO provided the individual information regarding the UA.	Information Provided
67.	Person asked if DOC followed through on OCO recommendations from a 2021 Work Release Report published by the OCO, regarding creating either a site specific or statewide orientation handbook. Person asked how he can obtain this orientation handbook, if it was completed by DOC, before arriving at work release.	The OCO provided information. The OCO reached out to DOC Headquarters asking if DOC completed the statewide work release handbook that they said they were working on in response to our report. DOC stated that the handbook was published in July and that it was delayed due to changes in the related WAC. DOC Headquarters he can request the handbook from his counselor or the reentry navigator.	Information Provided
68.	Person reported issues with his Custody Facility Plan review and that he wanted to attend, but his counselor had him sign paperwork waiving his right to attend, and that he did not realize what he was signing. Person said that he wanted to go to camp, but that was not considered at the meeting, and he felt misled by his counselor.	The OCO provided information. The OCO reached out to this individual's counselor and shared his concerns and requested that they talk with him and share details about his CFP review. His counselor, Custody Unit Supervisor, and the Correctional Program Manager responded stating that they have all talked with him about the plan multiple times and explained their recommendations and why they came to those conclusions. They stated that they talked about their plan with Headquarters Classification and were constrained by policy. The OCO could not find a violation of DOC 300.380 Classification and Custody Facility Plan Review.	Information Provided
69.	Person reported issues with the property sergeant not answering when his family comes to pick up his property. Person reported filing a 90-day property disposition form and has limited time for his family to come get his property.	The OCO provided information. The OCO reached out to the facility and received confirmation from the property sergeant that this individual's family picked up his property.	Information Provided
70.	Incarcerated individual expresses concern about his placement in solitary confinement. The individual also shared that the segregation unit he is housed in cannot access the tablets and would like to be transferred to a	The OCO provided information to the individual about his placement into segregation and he use of tablets in the segregation unit he was housed. The OCO reviewed the individual's segregation placement finding DOC placed the individual in segregation per DOC 320.250 Maximum Custody Placement/Transfer/Release. The OCO spoke with	Information Provided

	living unit where he can access the tablets.	DOC staff about tablet access for individuals housed in this segregation unit and DOC has completed negotiations with Securus to facilitate tablet use in this unit and they are working to get WiFi installed to get the tablets working.	
71.	Incarcerated individual reports that the segregation unit he is housed in cannot access the Securus tablets.	The OCO provided information. The OCO spoke with DOC staff about tablet access for individuals housed in this segregation unit and DOC has completed negotiations with Securus to facilitate tablet use in this unit and they are working to get WiFi installed to get the tablets working.	Information Provided
72.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about extended placement in IMU.	The OCO reached out to DOC and confirmed that the individual will be released from IMU once their transfer facility has bed space available.	Information Provided
73.	Loved one expressed concerns about an individual's custody facility plan and placement in IMU.	The OCO contacted DOC headquarters about this placement and informed the individual as to why they are currently placed in IMU. In doing so, the OCO was unable to locate a violation of DOC policy.	Information Provided
74.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about not being able to review photos and emails that are sent to them a second time.	The OCO confirmed with DOC that this is not an issue relating to the mailroom, but rather is a glitch on the tablet and advised the individual they will need to submit a help ticket to Securus.	Information Provided
75.	The individual reports that when he was in the Intensive Management Unit (IMU) at the facility, individuals were only able to access the phone during one of the OCO's hotline shifts during the week.	The OCO provided information regarding how individuals in the IMU would be able to access the OCO hotline if they are unable to access a phone during the OCO's scheduled hotline hours. This office spoke with Correctional Unit Supervisor (CUS) of the IMU who confirmed that if an individual is not in the yard during the OCO's hotline hours due to movement schedules, individuals may kite their classification counselor to arrange a call to the OCO when the hotline is open. DOC staff also verified that the Wi-Fi installation has begun, and when that is completed, individuals will be given tablets which they may use to make phone calls.	Information Provided
76.	Person reported that individuals in solitary confinement have not received tablets. Person also stated that he damaged his tablet and does not know who to send a payment to.	The OCO provided information. The OCO reached out to the facility and DOC Headquarters and received confirmation that funding has been secured for a subcontractor to install Wi-Fi, which was preventing tablets from being distributed in the solitary confinement unit. The OCO provided information about talking to the unit supervisor about paying for his damaged tablet.	Information Provided
77.	Person reports that his active Health Status Report (HSR) was canceled without the discussion or consultation with the provider. Person has multiple	The OCO provided information to the patient about the requested diet criteria. OCO staff contacted Health Services management and were informed that the patient did not meet the criteria for the special diet after further testing was completed.	Information Provided

digestive/health issues and the HSR was valid until 2024.

78.	The individual reports that the DOC is not allowing incarcerated individuals in partial confinement to vote as per RCW 29A.08.520. The individual reports that DOC infringes on the rights of individuals on Graduated Reentry (GRE) and work release. The individual submitted a resolutions request which was not accepted because it does not personally affect him.	The OCO provided information. RCW 29A.08.520 states “ For a felony conviction in a Washington state court, the right to vote is automatically restored as long as the person is not serving a sentence of total confinement under the jurisdiction of the department of corrections. For a felony conviction in a federal court or any state court other than a Washington state court, the right to vote is automatically restored as long as the person is no longer incarcerated. A person who has been convicted of a felony and is either sentenced to a term of total confinement under the jurisdiction of the department of corrections or otherwise incarcerated as provided for in this subsection must reregister to vote prior to voting.” Partial confinement pertains to individuals in work release, electronic home monitoring, and/or GRE. The individual is currently in total confinement. Per page 9 of the Resolution Program Manual (RPM), not accepted concerns include “Issues, incidents, policies, or practices which do not personally affect the individual.”	Information Provided
79.	Person reports that he was issued a negative BOE and had his mainline alternative diet cancelled after receiving the wrong meal. The person reports he tried to tell staff that he was given the wrong meal but was told to just take the meal.	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy by DOC. OCO staff verified that the person challenged the BOE through the appropriate channels. The person has the option to self-select foods that meet his goals. Enrollment guidelines for the lighter fare diet states the lighter fare diet can only be initiated once per calendar year. DOC 610.240 The Therapeutic Diet Guidelines (Attachment 1) will be used to ensure adequacy and consistency of therapeutic diets. a. Individuals may self-select food items from the mainline diet for dietary conditions outlined in Attachment 1. b. Any other therapeutic diet is considered Level 2 care and requires authorization per the Washington DOC Health Plan. The OCO encouraged the patient to discuss the amended BOE with their medical provider.	No Violation of Policy
80.	Person reported that a corrections officer made a comment to him that he felt was intended to provoke him. Person reported that he filed a resolution request, but it was administratively withdrawn after the sergeant attempted to interview him in the yard, and this person would only speak with him	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO reviewed this individual’s resolution request and the Resolution Program Manual, which on page 15 requires that an individual be interviewed during a Level 1 investigation but does not specify where or how it must occur, nor require that the investigation be confidential. Page 14 of the Resolution Program Manual states that “if at any time during the resolution process the individual refuses to be	No Violation of Policy

	in a confidential sit-down interview.	interviewed or refuses to participate in an interview, the resolution or appeal will be administratively withdrawn”.	
81.	Patient reports concerns about DOC medical not following a medication increase recommended by the cardiology specialist.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. This office reviewed related medical records and discussed medication changes with DOC health services. The medication increase reported by the patient was not medically indicated or ordered by the clinician.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
82.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about being targeted by a certain staff member and getting an infraction.	The OCO reviewed the infraction and found the individual’s behavior as well as admittance of guilt substantiated the infraction. The OCO was unable to locate sufficient evidence of staff targeting as the individual has not filed any grievances about staff misconduct.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
83.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about an infraction they received.	The OCO reviewed the infraction narrative and found the individual’s behavior met the infraction elements per DOC 460.000.	No Violation of Policy
84.	Person reported that DOC staff came to his door to give him his property while he was sleeping, and he asked for it to be dropped through the door. Person stated that staff returned with more officers and then entered his room and gave him his property. Person stated that he felt intimidated by that many staff entering his room, and that they were aggressive and hostile.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO reviewed this individual’s resolutions investigation, which was reviewed at the superintendent and headquarters level and found that staff entering this individual’s cell was within policy. DOC 420.320 Searches of Incarcerated Individuals states that “Correctional employees may enter and search a housing area at any time without prior notice or an incarcerated individual’s approval and without the individual’s presence.”	No Violation of Policy
85.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about an infraction they received.	The OCO reviewed the infraction narrative and found the individual’s behavior met the infraction elements per DOC 460.000.	No Violation of Policy
86.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about an infraction they received.	The OCO reviewed the infraction narrative and found the individual’s behavior met the infraction elements per DOC 460.000.	No Violation of Policy
87.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about an infraction they received.	The OCO reviewed the infraction and found the individual’s behavior met the infraction elements, thus, there is no violation of DOC policy 460.000.	No Violation of Policy
88.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about an infraction they received.	The OCO reviewed the infraction and found the individual’s behavior met the infraction elements, thus, there was no violation of DOC policy 460.000.	No Violation of Policy
89.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about an infraction they received.	The OCO reviewed the infraction materials and was unable to locate a violation of DOC policy as the individual’s behavior met the infraction elements per DOC 460.000.	No Violation of Policy

Olympic Corrections Center

90.	Loved one expressed concerns about an incarcerated individual having to attend a cultural event rather than being able to go to work.	The OCO was unable to locate a violation of DOC policy. The OCO reviewed the concern and found the individual volunteered to attend the cultural event. Per the facility's operational memorandum, religious services including cultural events take priority over work programs.	No Violation of Policy
-----	---	---	------------------------

Other - Out of State

91.	External person is asking for an incarcerated individual to return from an out of state transfer. They reported that the individual is living in inhumane conditions.	The OCO contacted DOC Classifications and Special Investigations Services to discuss when this individual can return. The DOC maintains that this individual is still considered a security threat and has declined to transfer him back to WA State. The WA state DOC has denied that the conditions in the receiving state are inhumane. The OCO lacks the jurisdiction to investigate the conditions of out-of-state prisons. The DOC is acting within DOC 330.600 Prison Compact.	No Violation of Policy
-----	---	---	------------------------

Stafford Creek Corrections Center

92.	Individual has been in the administrative segregation pending PREA investigations, while he has been in solitary confinement he was removed from his chemical dependency treatment	The OCO reviewed this individual's placement and custody facility plan. This office verified he was removed from his programming and had been housed in administrative segregation for over 30 days. The current facility had requested a transfer out of the facility due to safety concerns, however there is no documented evidence to substantiate a threat to the institution. He was never infraacted and his custody level did not change. Due to a medical hold, he was stuck at the facility in solitary confinement until the medical hold was complete. The OCO contacted the Superintendent and requested that the individual be placed in the transfer pod while he was awaiting the transfer. The OCO made public recommendations to the DOC for updates on their Transfer Pod protocols and to create a better review process for medical holds. The DOC has agreed to the recommendations.	Assistance Provided
93.	Patient reports that her gender affirming surgeries are being delayed by DOC.	The OCO provided assistance by contacting Health Services Management. OCO staff verified that the delay was caused by a need for updated documentation that was required by the Health Care Authority. The OCO verified the paperwork was completed and has placed the appointments on the appointment tracker where they will be monitored.	Assistance Provided
94.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about an infraction they received.	The OCO reviewed the infraction narrative and found the behavior did not meet the infraction elements. As a result, the OCO contacted the facility management to ask about dismissing the infraction, however, the facility was unwilling.	Assistance Provided

Thus, the OCO contacted DOC headquarters and requested the infraction be dismissed, DOC headquarters lowered the infraction to a general infraction.

95. The individual reports that he lost his job when he was taken to administrative segregation. He would like help getting his job back.	The OCO verified that this individual had lost his job. This office contacted the facility leadership and DOC HQ to inquire about the job loss. The DOC has said that this individual lost his job due to a unit move, however he is prioritized for a position in his current unit.	Assistance Provided
96. External person reported that their loved one has a medical concern that had gotten worse since entering DOC custody. They are requesting these issues be treated.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to OCO involvement. OCO staff contacted Health Services management and were informed the patient was already scheduled for a specialist evaluation of the issue. OCO staff monitored the status of the consult on the appointment tracker until the completion of necessary procedures.	DOC Resolved
97. External person reports their loved one uses a wheelchair and has been requesting full fingered wheelchair gloves. The gloves currently offered are not high quality and get torn quickly.	The OCO provided information regarding the gloves that are currently available within DOC. DOC has authorized two types of gloves for wheelchair users; alternative gloves must be approved by the Accommodation Review Committee at the patient's facility.	Information Provided
98. Person reported that he is hearing impaired and has missed meals and callouts because staff are not using the PA system. Person has filed a resolution request, and DOC responded that there are no written policies or memos requiring PA announcements.	The OCO provided information. The OCO reviewed the resolution request investigation and found that individual units cannot use the PA system for announcements because it broadcasts to the entire facility and interferes with prison movements. The OCO reached out to the facility ADA coordinator and asked about an amplified alternative listening system, which the individual mentioned in his resolution request, and asked if the facility could accommodate this individual's hearing impairment. The ADA coordinator responded that the facility is not currently equipped with an amplified alternative listening system, and that this individual has applied for an access assistant to help him not miss meals and callouts, which is under review.	Information Provided
99. Person reports that he filed a resolution request to see a specialist to receive medical shoes. The response from DOC was that he had an appointment scheduled but it has not occurred and he is asking that the OCO assist him in getting the appointment scheduled sooner.	The OCO provided information to the patient regarding limitations of this office's authority. The OCO cannot change appointments in community healthcare clinics. These appointments are scheduled based on availability.	Information Provided
100. A loved one reported that an incarcerated individual was placed	The OCO provided information. The OCO reviewed DOC records and found that this individual was found guilty of an infraction and	Information Provided

in segregation for an incident he had nothing to do with.

did not appeal, and that DOC demoted this individual's custody level and is planning to move him due to safety concerns. The OCO could not find a violation of DOC 300.380 Classification and Custody Facility Plan Review. The OCO provided information about how to report concerns to the OCO and encouraged him to appeal future infractions.

101. The individual reports concerns regarding staff discrimination. The individual says that a sergeant in his unit told him that he would have to do extra work duties for the sergeant and spoke to him in a disrespectful way. The person also reports concerns about their release date.	The OCO provided information. This office reviewed the investigation of the individual's resolution request and was unable to substantiate that he had been discriminated against. The OCO did verify that upon DOC staff reviewing the individual's resolution request, a notification was sent to all staff stating that any incarcerated person can complete their extra duty with any staff member, and DOC staff extended the timeframe on the individual's sanction to accommodate completion of the extra work duty. The OCO also provided information regarding the individual's release date.	Information Provided
102. External person reports their loved one was diagnosed with cancer and has not received treatment.	The OCO contacted health services to request follow up on this concern. This office confirmed the patient was referred for additional testing and surgical consult. The patient met with their provider for counseling/education. A treatment plan will be created based on results of scan and surgical consultation. The OCO added this case to the appointment tracker and provided the individual with information about next steps in treatment planning and how to follow up with the OCO directly if they have future medical concerns.	Information Provided
103. Person reported that the meal served for Juneteenth was culturally insensitive, especially in comparison to the meal served on the 4th of July and continues to promote a culture of racial and ethnic superiority and separation. Person stated the meal did not promote the inclusion of all diverse races of the people within SCCC.	The OCO provided information. The OCO reviewed the meal schedule for SCCC and contacted to the facility food manager, who confirmed that the meal that was served on Juneteenth was a regular mainline meal and was not intended specifically for the holiday. The OCO shared that this individual believes that there should be a culturally appropriate meal served on Juneteenth as there is for other holidays, and the food manager stated that decision would have to come from DOC Headquarters. The OCO shared information about writing to DOC Headquarters with that request. The OCO reached out to the Director of the Office of Equity, Diversity, Inclusion, and Respect and the Director of Correctional Services at DOC Headquarters, who provided information about how Cultural Groups can work with the facility to plan an event and a meal in celebration of Juneteenth.	Information Provided

104. The individual reports that he does not have access to proper rain gear. He reports that he likes to walk outside and the rain ponchos available to purchase are low quality and rip easily. The individual reports that not having proper rain gear and getting wet outside has caused medical complications.	The OCO provided information. Per DOC 440.000, Personal Property in Prisons, individuals may obtain property through commissary, department approved vendors, education or religious programs, hobby craft items made be the individual and authorized for retention, and digital media received from the Veteran's Administration. The OCO recommended that the individual walk indoors at the gym when it is raining to prevent medical complications caused by getting wet, and to see his medical provider should any complications arise. DOC staff report that better quality items for purchase are currently being researched.	Information Provided
105. The individual reports that he was charged a co-pay for ongoing treatment. The individual says that his provider asked to see him, he did not ask to be put on the list for sick call. The individual reports that since this isn't a sick call issue, he should not have been charged.	The OCO provided the individual with self-advocacy information. This office reviewed the individual's resolution requests regarding this concern and found that he received an informal resolution attempt at level 0. This office encouraged the individual to follow up with the Resolutions Specialist and Incarcerated Individual Banking to confirm that he has been refunded. If the individual is not able to resolve this issue through communicating with DOC staff, he may file a resolution request to a level II and this office may review this concern further.	Information Provided
106. The individual reports that he received a closing letter from the OCO regarding DOC HQ resolutions agreeing to reopen and review his resolution request which was closed based on hearsay. The individual reports he later received a letter from DOC HQ resolutions restating that the resolution request was hearsay.	The OCO provided information. At time of first case closure, it was OCO's understanding that the resolution request would be reopened, however, DOC rescinded this upon realization that the individual did not file an appeal per the Resolution Program Manual (RPM). The resolution request was not accepted per page 8 of the RPM which states that actions of persons outside the jurisdiction of the facility/office are not accepted concerns. DOC staff report that they are not able to verify whether someone outside of the DOC did or did not send certain items in the mail to the individual, and there was no rejection notice from the mailroom.	Information Provided
107. Patient reports that he uses a wheelchair and the gloves provided by DOC are not high quality and get torn up quickly with use. The patient is requesting full fingered gripped gloves.	The OCO provided information regarding the gloves that are currently available within DOC. DOC has authorized two types of gloves for wheelchair users. Alternative gloves must be approved by the Accommodation Review Committee at the patient's facility. OCO staff verified the patient was issued new gloves when they reported the gloves were damaged by use.	Information Provided
108. Patient reports he is on the transplant list and has been waiting for two years. The patient believes DOC did not	The OCO provided information to the patient regarding the medical records reviewed. The patient was also provided with tort claim information. Individuals who have been harmed	Information Provided

appropriately protect him from COVID through appropriate housing, resulting in him needing to take a medication that caused him to have an adverse reaction. The patient is concerned about the long term effects of that medication. The requested resolution is to receive the transplant and monetary compensation.

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.

109.	Incarcerated person reports he is on the out of state transfer list and DOC is pushing to move him but he has a court case pending.	The OCO could not find evidence to substantiate that this individual has any upcoming or pending court dates.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
110.	Individual reports that his food is being tainted with semen, cat feces, and cat urine. He is housed in solitary confinement. He has filed multiple resolutions with no response.	The OCO contacted the Superintendent and asked for a review of this concern. This office also reviewed the Resolutions filed and the rewrite reasons. There was no evidence to substantiate his food was tainted, however the CUS agreed to allow him to pick his own food to resolve his issue. While onsite, at an unannounced visit, the OCO watched the food being served in the IMU and did not see any issues or witness complaints from the population.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
111.	Person reports the resolution specialist is resolving requests incorrectly and isn't making sure the grievance is actually resolved before closing.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. OCO staff reviewed the resolution request and verified that the actions taken in response to the grievance matched the resolution requested by the person. If a person is unsatisfied with the result they must appeal the informal resolution and provide DOC with information as to why the response was not sufficient to resolve the issue.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
112.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about an infraction they received.	The OCO reviewed the infraction and was unable to locate a violation of DOC policy as the individual's behavior meets the infraction elements.	No Violation of Policy
113.	A loved one of the incarcerated individual reports that their Extended Family Visits (EFVs) were denied due an infraction the individual received several years ago. The loved one reports that the individual has not received any infractions since then that would disqualify him from participating in EFVs.	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy by DOC. Per DOC 590.100, Extended Family Visiting, "An applicant with any documented history/indicator of domestic violence against any person of a like relationship to the individual may be excluded from participating in an EFV." The DOC defines arrests, convictions, or any other indication of domestic violence on their record as a domestic violence indicator which could exclude their participation in EFVs per policy. The DOC determined that DV concerns were cause for denial for this individual. This office verified that	No Violation of Policy

regular visits with the individual's wife were approved.

114.	The individual reports that Extended Family Visits (EFVs) have been denied due to a domestic violence (DV) indicator which he says was a false report.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. Per DOC 590.100, Extended Family Visiting, "An applicant with any documented history/indicator of domestic violence against any person of a like relationship to the individual may be excluded from participating in an EFV." The DOC defines arrests, convictions, or any other indication of domestic violence on their record as a domestic violence indicator which could exclude their participation in EFVs per policy. The DOC determined that DV concerns were cause for denial for this individual.	No Violation of Policy
115.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about an infraction they received.	The OCO reviewed the infraction narrative and related materials and was unable to find a violation of DOC policy as the individual's behaviors met the infraction elements.	No Violation of Policy
116.	The individual reports that his Graduated Reentry (GRE) was terminated. The individual reports that he was told he would have his Good Conduct Time (GCT) restored if he remained infraction free for a year but was then told he does not have enough time on his sentence to restore his GCT.	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy by DOC. Per DOC 350.100 Earned Release Time, two of the individual's infractions are not eligible for restoration after one year, and a restoration plan cannot put an individual less than 120 days to their ERD. Per policy, individuals need to be targeted for completion at least 10 months before their ERD.	No Violation of Policy
117.	External person reported their loved one was issued an infraction and later was taken to administrative segregation.	The OCO reviewed the administrative segregation placement and the pending infractions. The OCO reviewed the available records and was unable to identify evidence of the behavior described in the infraction. The OCO contacted the DOC and asked for the infractions to be dismissed. The DOC declined the OCO's request to dismiss the infraction; instead, the DOC rewrote the infraction and maintained the individual in administrative segregation pending the outcome of the hearing.	Substantiated
118.	External person reported that her loved one was laid off from his job and DOC reported that he was terminated.	The OCO substantiated that this individual was told he was laid off from his job, however, his electronic record stated that he had been terminated for disciplinary reasons. This office contacted the Superintendent regarding this issue; the facility reported that the information had been entered incorrectly and agreed to edit the termination reason in the system.	Substantiated
119.	External person reported an individual was placed in segregation after filing a resolution request about DOC	The OCO was able to substantiate that this individual filed a resolution request, his cell was searched, and he was placed in administrative segregation pending a hearing at which the infraction was ultimately dismissed.	Substantiated

staff mismanaging the cultural groups.

120. External person reported that their loved one was served with an infraction, but the hearing was not scheduled.	The OCO substantiated that the individual had received their original infraction report within the appropriate DOC timeline, however, the DOC then rewrote the infractions and the hearing was postponed. The OCO substantiated that this is a violation of WAC 137-28-290(3) which states “[i]f an [incarcerated person] is placed in prehearing confinement in segregation, the hearing will be held within 3 business days of service of the infraction report and supporting documents.” The OCO asked the DOC to expedite the hearing to avoid a prolonged stay in administrative segregation, however, the hearing was still delayed. The individual was ultimately found not guilty of the infraction.	Substantiated
121. External person reported that their loved one was found not guilty of an infraction but was still transferred from the facility. Additionally, external person reported that their loved one had been transferred to solitary at the new facility when they were supposed to go to general population.	The OCO was able to substantiate that the DOC transfer order had been written by headquarters staff and indicated that this individual should be maintained in segregation instead of transferring to general population, even after the infraction was dismissed. The OCO spoke with DOC leadership who reported that the transfer order had been written incorrectly. As a result, this individual was held in solitary confinement throughout a long holiday weekend.	Substantiated
122. Patient reports he was diagnosed with latent TB and was not treated when he was diagnosed before leaving DOC custody. When the patient returned to DOC he was not given treatment until he was transferred to another facility.	The OCO was able to substantiate this concern. OCO staff reviewed records and contacted staff to confirm the patient had received necessary treatment for latent infection. It was noted during the investigation that the patient was diagnosed during a severe outbreak and treatment had to be prioritized for those who were actively infected in that facility. DOC followed recommendations from the CDC and WA Department of Health in the management of the outbreak. OCO staff substantiated that upon his return to DOC the patient was not entered into treatment. This was discovered by DOC nursing staff and treatment was initiated when the patient transferred to another facility. OCO staff verified the patient has completed treatment. The OCO provided the patient with tort claim information.	Substantiated

Washington Corrections Center

123. Patient reports a need for surgery and is scheduled for a consult but is concerned the surgery is not scheduled yet. He is close to his release date and says his medical issues have not been addressed.	The OCO elevated the concerns to DOC health services leadership. The patient was scheduled with the re-entry nurse, but the appointment was cancelled and the patient was unable to be rescheduled in time before release. A reentry packet was provided to the patient. DOC’s	Assistance Provided
--	--	---------------------

Patient requested an appointment with the re-entry nurse prior to release and a surgery appointment to attend post-release. Person also reports DOC used the incorrect size catheter and complained of bleeding and pain.

response to OCO outreach was delayed. After continued outreach, DOC later agreed to a records review and discussion of catheter sizing concerns. This person has released from prison since reporting this concern.

124.	Incarcerated individual states they filed an infraction appeal and never heard back.	The OCO reached out to DOC who states they never received the appeal but at OCO request stated they would be willing to accept a resubmitted appeal.	Assistance Provided
125.	Person reported that staff told him he would be transferred to a facility where he has safety concerns. Person stated that he told staff he is refusing housing placement there and was concerned that staff would use force on him.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO reviewed DOC records and found that this individual was transferred to the facility where he had safety concerns, and that he refused housing and was transferred to a different facility that he stated is safer for him. The OCO also reviewed DOC Incident Reports and could not find a record of a Use of Force incident.	DOC Resolved
126.	Person reported that he is being denied access to the courts, and that he has documents he needs to send to the courts. Person said he was supposed to be on the call out to go to the Law Library, but that did not happen.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO reviewed this individual's resolution request and reached out to the facility law librarian asking if this individual was able to access the law library. The law librarian provided a document showing that this individual was able to access the law library multiple times before being transferred to another facility.	DOC Resolved
127.	The individual reports issues with the resolution department. The person says that he will sometimes receive rewrite requests which are not returned in time for him to complete the rewrite within the timeframes given. He reports he filed a resolution request regarding staff misconduct which was administratively withdrawn. The individual reports that his resolution requests are not being properly processed.	The OCO provided information. This office reviewed the individual's recent resolution requests and found that he has several accepted at levels I, II, and III. The OCO verified that the individual did have some resolution requests that were not accepted due to having five active per page 9 of the Resolution Program Manual (RPM). This office verified that rewrites requests were sometimes not received on time, but could not verify that the individual was not given time to submit the rewrite as outlined in the RPM. The resolution request that the individual referenced that was administratively withdrawn was done so by DOC HQ resolutions, as an administrative investigation may be initiated and will be administratively withdrawn and resolved through an appropriate investigation, and no further correspondence will be given to the individual. The OCO verified that this letter was written and should have been received by the individual.	Information Provided

128.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about having to move units and the desire to return to the original unit.	The OCO informed the individual that cell moves are nongrieveable concerns. The individual would need to complete DOC form 21-595 "Cell Change Request" to return to the desired cell.	Information Provided
129.	A loved one of the individual reports that the individual's life has been threatened at his current facility. The loved one reports that the individual was in the Intensive Management Unit (IMU) for protective custody, but was returned to general population. The person reports that the individual has spoken with Intelligence and Investigations Units (IIU) but his safety concerns have not been taken seriously.	The OCO provided information. This office reviewed the individual's placement plans and confirmed that the DOC is taking his housing and safety concerns seriously. The individual was transferred to another facility and his placement is being reviewed.	Information Provided
130.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about an infraction they received for failure to provide a urinary analysis (UA) but state they had an HSR at the time.	The OCO reviewed the infraction narrative and requested any HSR records the individual had in place at the time but no responsive records were located, thus, the OCO was unable to substantiate the individual's narrative.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
131.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about an infraction they received.	The OCO reviewed the individual's infraction history and was unable to locate the infraction the individual expressed concerns about. Thus, there was insufficient evidence for the OCO to complete an investigation about this concern.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
132.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about an infraction they received.	The OCO reviewed the infraction narrative and found the individual's actions met the infraction elements, thus there is no violation of DOC Policy.	No Violation of Policy
133.	External person reports his son was put in solitary confinement and was having mental health issues. Due to an infraction he may go to close custody.	The OCO was able to confirm when this concern was reported that the individual was moved back to general population, however the individual received another infraction and it changed their custody to Max. They will be given a program to complete before they can return to general population. The OCO met with the incarcerated individual at the facility regarding this concern. There is no violation of DOC 320.250	No Violation of Policy
134.	The individual reports that he was denied Extended Family Visits (EFVs) due to the DOC citing Domestic Violence (DV) indicators as well as not being amenable to mandatory programming. The individual reports that the DV indicators are unfounded and says the EFV policy is discriminatory towards individuals who proclaim innocence because the	The OCO was unable to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. Per DOC 590.100, Extended Family Visiting, Individuals with a sex offense listed in Attachment 2 will only be eligible for an EFV if screened through the required programming and approved by the EFV Review Committee. Programming unit employees/staff must determine the individual as amenable to the required programming and the individual must participate when eligible. The individual was found to be not amenable to the required programming. The DOC does not have jurisdiction	No Violation of Policy

mandatory programming requires admission of guilt. over the individual's charges or conviction. The OCO also verified that the individual does have DV indicators.

135.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about an infraction they received.	The OCO reviewed the infraction and was unable to locate a violation of DOC policy as the individual's behaviors met the infraction elements.	No Violation of Policy
136.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about their infraction appeal not being processed according to timeframes.	The OCO reviewed the infraction and found no violation of DOC Policy as WAC 137-28-400 states "the time limitations expressed in these regulations are not jurisdictional and failure to adhere to any particular time limit shall not be grounds for reversal or dismissal of a disciplinary proceeding."	No Violation of Policy

Washington Corrections Center for Women

137.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about an infraction they received.	The OCO reviewed the individual's infraction history and found this infraction was dismissed after the infraction hearing.	DOC Resolved
138.	Person reports she was told she would be started on treatment for a chronic infection. She has requested the treatment several times and has gone through the preliminary testing to begin. The patient believes the facility medical director is preventing her from starting treatment.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO contacted Health Services management and was informed the patient is scheduled for the appointment where she will start treatment within the month.	DOC Resolved
139.	Person reports concern about being pulled out of a program, terminated from her job and placed into a different behavioral program. She is concerned that this new program will add time to her sentence and that she will be held past her release date. Person expressed concern for her safety and that she was being retaliated against.	The OCO provided information. The OCO reviewed DOC records and found that her release plan has been approved. This office reached out to her counselor asking if she will be released on her Earned Release Date or if she will be held until she finishes the behavioral program. Her counselor stated that she will be released on her Earned Release Date as per her approved release plan. The OCO was not able to substantiate that she was being retaliated against and provided information about reporting safety concerns.	Information Provided
140.	Patient reports pain medication was discontinued by DOC when she entered prison.	The OCO provided information about pathways for nonformulary medication and next steps in healthcare protocol. This office confirmed the individual has received treatment options under DOC Health Plan and related information from health services staff.	Information Provided
141.	Patient reports concerns about accessing Medication Assisted Treatment (MAT) program.	The OCO received updates from the patient that she has been able to extend medication after discussion with MAT doctor and is pleased with treatment at this time. The person asked that their OCO case remain open indefinitely and OCO provided information about our process and case	Information Provided

timelines. The person can contact the OCO if new or ongoing issues arise to open a new case.

142. Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about the inability to have legal paperwork in the receiving units and stated that it is thrown out.	The OCO reached out to DOC and confirmed DOC does not allow individuals to have legal documents while housed in the receiving units due to there not being any lockers in the cells to secure the paperwork, but they are given the documents once moved to general population. In the interim, the documents are placed in records, not thrown away.	Information Provided
--	---	----------------------

Washington State Penitentiary

143. External person reported that their loved one's mental health has been deteriorating since they have been in solitary confinement. This has been going on for two years.	The OCO did an in-person visit with the individual. This office was able to verify that he was not engaging with the OCO staff. The OCO contacted the Superintendent and asked for mental health staff to review this individual. After a review by mental health, this individual was approved for a Residential Treatment Unit.	Assistance Provided
---	---	---------------------

144. Patient reports a need for an urgent EKG based on active symptoms.	The OCO provided assistance by elevating the concern to health services and requesting resolution. After OCO outreach, the patient was scheduled for an EKG. This office added the case to our appointment tracker and confirmed the test was scheduled and occurred.	Assistance Provided
---	---	---------------------

145. Individual reports he has been housed in long-term isolation due to involuntary protective custody. He wants to return to general population.	The OCO reviewed this concern and contacted DOC HQ regarding placement. Currently the DOC is working on a new custody facility plan and custody promotion. He has now been moved to general population.	Assistance Provided
--	---	---------------------

146. Patient reports medical needs and requested Extraordinary Medical Placement (EMP) or compassionate release.	The OCO provided assistance by contacting DOC health services and elevating the concerns through HQ leadership. This office substantiated the person's SAGE review was pending completion at headquarters and after OCO outreach, the person's review was complete and they were approved for transfer to the SAGE unit. The OCO also contacted the EMP Coordinator to confirm the patient's review is in progress and DOC agreed to follow up with the outcome.	Assistance Provided
--	--	---------------------

147. Person reported inconsistencies with showers in the unit, and that the Custody Unit Supervisor (CUS) told him there are no scheduled showers for unit workers, even though worker showers used to be the norm in the unit. Person said that officers are picking and choosing how showers run in the unit. Person stated that when he told officers that he wanted to wait	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO spoke with the Custody Unit Supervisor, who stated that the unit has recently updated their unit manual and discontinued the practice of extra showers for in-unit workers. She cited that the number of in-unit workers and the staff time necessary to facilitate the extra shower times took away from staff's ability to provide additional yard time. The CUS also confirmed that each cell must decide as a group whether or not they will both shower. The CUS stated that there has been confusion among	Assistance Provided
---	---	---------------------

for worker showers later in the day, his cellmate was not allowed to shower, and that he was told they both had to say yes or no.

staff about this change in practice, and some staff have still been offering worker showers. After talking with the OCO, she said she would email all unit staff to clarify the change in protocol, so that staff will no longer be inconsistent about the shower protocol.

<p>148. External person reports that her loved one was taken to administrative segregation after he was attacked. He was found not guilty of an infraction, but is still in solitary confinement. In addition, his property will be thrown out after 30 days and due to his sentencing structure and he needs to have approval from DOC Classifications to move to another facility. Until his approval, he cannot move to the transfer pod.</p>	<p>The OCO reviewed the administrative segregation placement and confirmed the individual was found not guilty of the infraction. Due to the incident, the individual was no longer safe at the facility. the individual was not allowed to move into a transfer pod until their transfer was finalized at the HQ level. The OCO contacted the facility and asked for property to be held due to the extended process of his transfer finalization. After reviewing this concern, the OCO found multiple negative impacts due to outdated DOC procedure. The OCO requested the DOC update their process on LWOP Restrictive Housing Case review, Transfer Pod protocol and WSP 440.000 Operational Memo. The DOC agreed to the OCO recommendations.</p>	<p>Assistance Provided</p>
<p>149. Multiple individuals at WSP approached the OCO staff while on an in person visit to express concerns related to phone time. They reported that the phones turn off at 9, however Securus allows for them to stay on until 11. WSP is the only facility that turns the phones off at 9.</p>	<p>The OCO verified that the phones at WSP turn off at 9, however the phones at other facilities are open until 11. This office contacted DOC leadership at WSP and DOC HQ leadership to negotiate a change in the phone time to align with other facilities. The DOC agreed to allow access until 11.</p>	<p>Assistance Provided</p>
<p>150. Person requested to be given a caloric breakdown of the DOC menu. They had requested this from DOC staff but staff could not provide the menu breakdown.</p>	<p>OCO provided assistance to the person by reaching out to DOC headquarters. OCO staff requested the caloric break down of the DOC menu and where the document could be found by incarcerated people. OCO does not provide records received from DOC to incarcerated individuals, thus the person was provided with the location this document should be available. Per DOC HQ staff, the menu calorie breakdown should be available on the living units and/or the law library. OCO asked DOC staff to provide the person access to the document; DOC staff confirmed the person has access.</p>	<p>Assistance Provided</p>
<p>151. Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about not receiving an appeal response.</p>	<p>The OCO reached out to DOC and confirmed that they did not receive the appeal, but upon OCO request, agreed to accept a rewritten appeal despite it being submitted outside of timeframes.</p>	<p>Assistance Provided</p>
<p>152. Patient reports he was issued medical equipment by a specialist</p>	<p>The OCO provided assistance by contacting Health Services Management and requesting the device be located and requested that a plan be made for</p>	<p>Assistance Provided</p>

	that was removed from his possession by custody staff.	ensuring the device could be used effectively. OCO provided the patient with information about how medical staff would be providing access to the device.	
153.	Loved one expressed concerns about an incarcerated individual's placement in IMU.	The OCO reviewed the individual's placement in IMU and found that DOC removed the individual from IMU prior to OCO involvement.	DOC Resolved
154.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about their facility and custody placement.	The OCO reviewed the individual's custody facility plan that is currently being worked on and see that DOC is working to resolve the individual's concerns.	DOC Resolved
155.	The individual reports safety concerns in his current cell and reports he has been attacked twice in the past.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. This office verified that the individual placed himself in voluntary protective custody shortly after this concern was reported.	DOC Resolved
156.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about the change in DOC Policy 420.385 and how it would impact a previous positive UA.	The OCO informed the individuals that the change in DOC Policy 420.385 surrounding presumptive drug testing is solely for objects and substances such as paper and pills, not for UAs. The UA policy that allows individuals to send out UAs to an external lab for confirmatory testing is still in effect and has not been changed.	Information Provided
157.	A loved one reported that a group of incarcerated individuals are a part of a Native American lodge that is having a sacred powwow. They reported that their regalia had been ordered through the religious coordinator's office and has not been given to the incarcerated individuals.	The OCO provided information. The OCO spoke with the religious coordinator who acknowledged that he forgot to order beads and leather for this group but confirmed that they did have their regalia and that the sacred powwow was able to happen as planned, and that he worked with the group to find items to replace the beads and leather he did not order.	Information Provided
158.	The individual reports that he received an infraction which makes him ineligible for Extended Family Visits (EFVs). The individual reports that he has only received one serious infraction during his incarceration. The individual wants to know if there is a way to reduce the amount of time that he is ineligible for EFVs.	The OCO provided information regarding participation in EFVs. Per DOC 590.100, Extended Family Visiting, "Individuals found guilty of any of the following infractions will not be eligible for EFV privileges. Time limits pertaining to infractions start on the date the infraction occurred." This office verified that the individual received an infraction which makes him ineligible for EFVs within five years of the date he was infraacted. The individual may still apply for EFVs, and if denied the participation of the EFV program, individuals may appeal per DOC 590.100.	Information Provided
159.	The individual reports that his mother was denied visitation with him due to a charge she received many years ago with the individual named as a victim. The person says that he has not seen his mother since he was a child and does not	The OCO provided information regarding how the individual's mother may appeal the visitation denial. This office spoke with DOC HQ staff who confirmed that the individual's mother may appeal the denial and provide information around the circumstances around the charge mentioned and the DOC would consider this information in	Information Provided

think that this information is accurate. The individual reports that he is trying to reestablish a relationship with his mother and wants to know how to get their visits approved.

the appeal.

160. Incarcerated individual reports two people died by suicide at their facility and there is no way for them for contact the media.	RCW 72.09.770 directs DOC to conduct an unexpected fatality review (UFR) in any case in which the death of an incarcerated individual is unexpected, or any case identified by the OCO for review. The OCO will conduct a review of records associated with these deaths. This case will be reviewed by the unexpected fatality review team, consisting of the OCO, DOC, Department of Health, and Healthcare Authority. A report will be delivered to the governor and state legislators. It will also be publicly available on the DOC website.	Information Provided
161. Person requested OCO ask DOC Headquarters to add the list of state representatives and senators and their contact information to the Electronic Law Library app on the Securus Tablet. Person stated that he has access to this information, but it would be easier if it was on the tablet.	The OCO provided information about how to write to Securus and DOC Headquarters requesting they add that information to the Electronic Law Library app. The OCO does not have jurisdiction over Securus.	Information Provided
162. Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about having a custody facility plan done and losing their job as a result of a general infraction.	In accordance with DOC Policy 300.380(IV)(C) a review is done every 6 months to 1 year, thus it appears the individual was due for a review and there was no correlation between the infraction and the timing of the review. Regarding the job loss, DOC stated that anytime there is an incident related to drugs/alcohol, violence or job duties, an individual will be recommended for termination of the job regardless of if it is a general or serious infraction.	Information Provided
163. Patient reports concerns about not being able to begin Medication Assisted Treatment (MAT) while in prison and being redirected to begin MAT in the community upon release.	The OCO contacted DOC health services to gather information and request the patient's concerns be addressed prior to release. DOC reported the person was scheduled with a provider to discuss MAT initiation, however, an appointment was "no showed" and another was cancelled. Despite the patient beginning the process in advance of his release date, the individual did not have enough time to start inductions and was referred to community MAT resources.	Information Provided
164. Patient reports that he needs to go to outside medical appointments but has fears about the transporting staff harming him, claiming he tried to escape.	The OCO provided information to the patient regarding the risks of not going to the specialist. OCO staff contacted the patient and the patient's primary care provider. The patient's provider	Information Provided

informed this office that the patient was able to attend his outside appointment.

165.	External person submitted a letter from an incarcerated person reporting recent suicides at the facility and provided recommendations.	RCW 72.09.770 directs DOC to conduct an unexpected fatality review (UFR) in any case in which the death of an incarcerated individual is unexpected, or any case identified by the OCO for review. The OCO will conduct a review of records associated with these deaths. This case will be reviewed by the unexpected fatality review team, consisting of the OCO, DOC, Department of Health, and Healthcare Authority. A report will be delivered to the governor and state legislators. It will also be publicly available on the DOC website.	Information Provided
166.	The individual reports that he has been in the Intensive Management Unit (IMU) for several months but has completed programming. The individual reports he has been told he has to complete additional programming. The individual reports he was told he would get a custody override to medium at another facility, but was transferred to a different facility and is still in the IMU.	The OCO provided information. This office reviewed the individual's Custody Facility Plan (CFP) and found that it was completed per DOC Policy 300.380, Classification and Custody Facility Plan Review. At this time, the DOC is unwilling to approve a custody override to medium due to the nature of the infractions the individual has received. This office encouraged the individual to work with AMEND at his current facility and to continue to request a custody promotion at his future CFP reviews.	Information Provided
167.	The individual reports that people in the Intensive Management Unit (IMU) are allowed up to three hours of yard time per day. The individual says that when people are able to go to yard, they are left there for three hours without being able to use the bathroom or drink water. The person reports that people have received infractions for urinating in the drain which results in more time in the IMU.	The OCO provided information. This office spoke with the Correctional Unit Supervisor (CUS) of the IMU who reports individuals are offered up to three hours of yard time seven days per week, and unit staff conduct checks every 30 minutes. If an individual needs to use the bathroom or drink water, they will be taken back to their cell. Individuals in the IMU are made aware of their yard schedule and are given notice before their yard time so they may use the bathroom or drink water. The unit does not currently have the resources to escort individuals to and from yard to their cells, so if they request to return to their cell they will not be taken back to yard. The facility currently has plans to build outside recreation areas for individuals in the IMU which will have bathrooms and drinking water for the population to use during yard time.	Information Provided
168.	The individual reports that DOC changed his release date. The individual reports that he was taking a program in the Intensive Management Unit (IMU) but says that good time should not be taken while he was programming.	The OCO provided information. This office reviewed the individual's Earned Release Date (ERD) and could not find evidence that it had been changed. The OCO verified that the individual has an Release Plan (ORP) that is currently being investigated, however, there have been delays due to needing to find suitable housing. The	Information Provided

individual may write to DOC Records at: DOC Public Records Office PO Box 41118 Olympia WA 98504-1118, should he want more information regarding the calculation of his ERD.

<p>169. The individual reports that he received information that he was approved for Graduated Reentry (GRE) earlier this year, but he says that he has not received any information since then. The individual says he wants to know what he needs to do to get his GRE plan moving forward because the DOC has not provided him with any additional information.</p>	<p>The OCO provided information. This office found that the individual was initially approved for GRE, however, the DOC Intelligence and Investigations Unit (IIU) received information that the individual does not want to comply with community supervision rules. The Headquarters Community Screening Committee (HCSC) then denied the individual any partial confinement options. Per DOC 390.590, Graduated Reentry, the HCSC will make the final decision regarding GRE and partial confinement eligibility.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>170. Patient reports concerns about access to cancer testing and treatment.</p>	<p>The OCO contacted DOC health services to request review and follow up on the patient's concerns. This office added the case to our appointment tracker to confirm scheduled testing occurs. The OCO discussed the case with facility health services leadership and confirmed the patient is on the cancer tracker for monitoring. The OCO provided the patient with information about treatment planning next steps. A separate case was opened regarding the individual's primary Graduated Re-Entry (GRE) concerns.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>171. Patient reports he is not being allowed to wear his medical shoes on transports.</p>	<p>The OCO provided information to the patient regarding the current language used in his Health Status Report (HSR) and how to address the issue of staff not honoring established HSRs. The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>172. The individual reports that people have looked up the individual's name on the Securus tablet law library. The individual says that there were threats to his safety and he requested protective custody, and is now in the Intensive Management Unit (IMU).</p>	<p>The OCO provided information. This office is aware of this issue causing safety concerns for some individuals. The OCO is currently working with the DOC to resolve this concern. This office verified that the individual has since transferred to another facility and is no longer in the IMU.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>173. Person states that an officer took his food into the plumbers closet before giving it to him. He states he filed an emergency grievance but it was not handled as such. He states this was done out of retaliation. The person is</p>	<p>The OCO provided information to the person regarding the process to submit a staff conduct grievance. The person was also provided tort information. 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</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>

<p>requesting the OCO pull video records for him and make a paper trail. The person is requesting compensation.</p>	<p>(ORM). ORM is required by law (RCW Chapter 4.92) to receive these claims. The OCO does not retain DOC records for incarcerated individuals, any DOC records will need to be requested from the DOC.</p>	
<p>174. Incarcerated individual reports recent suicides at the facility and concerns about conditions of the mental health unit.</p>	<p>RCW 72.09.770 directs DOC to conduct an unexpected fatality review (UFR) in any case in which the death of an incarcerated individual is unexpected, or any case identified by the OCO for review. The OCO will conduct a review of records associated with these deaths. This case will be reviewed by the unexpected fatality review team, consisting of the OCO, DOC, Department of Health, and Healthcare Authority. A report will be delivered to the governor and state legislators. It will also be publicly available on the DOC website.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>175. Person requested information about how to contact Securus through a hotline for incarcerated individuals, and stated multiple issues with Securus. Person requested information about negotiations between DOC and the cable company. Person also requested information about filing a tort claim.</p>	<p>The OCO provided information. The OCO reached out to DOC Headquarters, who confirmed that this number is a Securus customer service hotline for friends and family, but not for the incarcerated. DOC has confirmed that there are no customer service hotlines for incarcerated individuals, and the only way for incarcerated individuals to contact Securus is through the help ticket system or by mail. The OCO is actively monitoring the transition to Securus and is still gathering information. The OCO does not have jurisdiction over Securus but is in discussion with DOC regarding their contract with Securus and is bringing issues and concerns from incarcerated individuals to DOC's attention. The OCO provided information about filing a public records request for regarding negotiations between DOC and the cable company. The OCO provided information about filing a tort claim. DOC 120.500 states "All incarcerated individual tort claims alleging personal property damage/loss must be filed by the individual with the Washington State Department of Enterprise Services (DES) Risk Management Division". RCW 4.92.100 states, "(1) All claims against the state, or against the state's officers, employees, or volunteers, acting in such capacity, for damages arising out of tortious conduct, must be presented to the office of risk management."</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
<p>176. Person reported that staff at his previous facility stole several items and his property and legal paperwork. Person also reported several issues with the Close Observation Area (COA), mental</p>	<p>The OCO provided information. The OCO reached out to property staff at WSP and his previous facility and confirmed that all his property was shipped and received, including his legal property. The OCO reached out to the Correctional Program Manager, Classification Counselor, and Custody Unit Supervisor and gathered information about</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>

health and custody staff, and with how he is being treated.	this person's mental health concerns and time in the COA and obtained a signed Request of Information (ROI) form to give us consent to access mental health records, but were not able to achieve a resolution on that issue. The OCO elevated this issue within the office and opened a new case to further investigate this individual's concerns with mental health and the COA.	
177. Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about the conduct of a hearings officer during an infraction hearing.	The OCO requested the records of the hearing audio but no records exist, thus the OCO was unable to further investigate this concern.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
178. Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about not being able to attend a legal hearing they had.	The OCO contacted DOC about this concern and DOC had no record of the individual having a recently scheduled legal hearing.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
179. Individual reports he is being held in solitary confinement and is on the out of state transfer list. He does not believe that he fits the criteria to be sent out of state.	The OCO verified that the DOC is within policy 330.600 to send him out of state. DOC policy states individuals will be considered for Prison Compact transfer for safety and security. This individual has been identified by the DOC as an STG leader who has participated in violent behavior towards other incarcerated individuals. This office does acknowledge the long waiting period for an out of state placement and has asked the DOC to find alternative placements besides solitary confinement.	No Violation of Policy
180. The individual reports that he ordered a bikini calendar which was rejected by the mailroom. The individual reports he received a similar calendar at another facility, and feels the rejection is based on morality rather than policy.	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy by DOC. This office reviewed the mail rejection notice and found that it was rejected per DOC 450.100, Mail for Individuals in Prison, Attachment 1, #36 states that mail may be rejected if it "contains a mental and/or inflexible binder." This office verified that the calendar was not rejected for the photos but rather for the binder.	No Violation of Policy
181. External person shared concerns about her son's placement in IMU. He was previously housed in same pod as someone with a keep separate. Now, they are concerned that he will be placed in the same pod as the victim's family members. He is not safe and should be moved.	The OCO reviewed this individual's placement and the keep separate orders on file. This office was able to confirm that they are not housed with any individuals they have a keep separate with. This office could not find a violation of DOC 300.380.	No Violation of Policy

INTAKE INVESTIGATIONS

Airway Heights Corrections Center

182.	An anonymous individual expressed concerns about the background of a staff member hired at DOC.	Per RCW 43.06C.040, the OCO has declined to investigate this concern as DOC has a process for staff background checks.	Declined
183.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about the parole board adding more time to their sentence.	The OCO declined to investigate this concern as per WAC 138-10-040(3)(a) as the ombuds lacks jurisdiction over the complaint.	Declined
184.	Incarcerated individual expressed frustrations with the redacted records they received from the OCO.	Per WAC 138-10-040(3)(g) the OCO has declined to investigate this concern as the OCO must follow the relevant RCW regarding redaction of public records requests.	Declined

Cedar Creek Corrections Center

185.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about a desire to go to work release.	The OCO declined to investigate this concern as per WAC 138-10-040(3)(b) as the Department took action to resolve any alleged violations.	Declined
------	--	---	----------

Coyote Ridge Corrections Center

186.	Person reports he was transferred to the main unit when he was told he would be at camp.	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
187.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about potential property loss in the future.	The OCO declined to investigate this case per WAC 138-10-040(3)(f) as the alleged violation is a future rather than ongoing issue.	Declined
188.	Loved one expressed concerns about being denied visitation access.	The OCO sent the incarcerated individual a review request form to confirm the individual wanted the concern investigated but the OCO did not receive a response within the allotted timeframe.	Person Declined OCO Involvement
189.	Loved one expressed concerns about the lack of reviews done for an incarcerated individual and the inability to set up video visits.	The OCO sent the incarcerated individual a review request form to confirm the individual wanted the OCO to investigate this concern but the individual did not return the form to the OCO.	Person Declined OCO Involvement

Monroe Correctional Complex

190.	Loved one expressed concerns about an individual being wrongfully kept in DOC custody after their scheduled release date.	The OCO declined to investigate this concern as per WAC 138-10-040(3)(a) the ombuds lacks jurisdiction over the complaint.	Declined
191.	Incarcerated person reported that they need new 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	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued

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

192.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about being held beyond their release date.	The OCO declined to investigate this concern, per WAC 138-10-040(3)(a) the ombuds lacks jurisdiction over the complaint.	Declined
193.	External person reports concerns about their loved one receiving unauthorized surgery during transport to another facility.	The incarcerated individual did not respond to the OCO's request to provide additional information within 30 days. The OCO also attempted free, confidential phone calls with the individual, which he declined. Additionally, the OCO followed up via mail multiple times.	Person Declined OCO Involvement
194.	Incarcerated individual expressed a desire to be reimbursed for lost property.	The OCO declined to investigate this case per WAC 138-10-040(3)(e) as the requested resolution is not within the ombuds' statutory power and authority.	Declined
195.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about the grievance process.	The OCO declined to investigate this concern per WAC 138-10-040(3)(b) as the Department took action to resolve any alleged violations as the individual included in their case intake narrative that DOC had resolved their grievance concern.	Declined

Other

196.	External individual expressed concerns about research being conducted on incarcerated people.	Per WAC 138-10-040(3) and RCW 43.06C.040(2)(c), the OCO may decline to investigate any complaint or may close any investigation for one of several reasons. In this instance, the concern did not identify the facility, the impacted person, or any details about the research.	Declined
------	---	--	----------

Stafford Creek Corrections Center

197.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about their lawyer's conduct.	The OCO declined to investigate this concern as per WAC 138-10-040(3)(a) as the ombuds lacks jurisdiction over the complaint.	Declined
198.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about needing legal assistance to file a civil suit.	The OCO declined to investigate this concern as per WAC 138-10-040(3)(e) the requested resolution is not within the ombuds' statutory power and authority.	Declined
199.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about their early release date (ERD).	The OCO declined to investigate this concern per WAC 138-10-040(3)(g) as the OCO is unable to change an individual's ERD.	Declined
200.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about an infraction sanction they received.	The OCO declined to investigate the concern per WAC 138-10-040(3)(g) as the OCO requires more information such as which infraction group number the concern is about in order to investigate. Additionally, all infractions must be appealed before the OCO can investigate.	Declined
201.	Individual reports that Black prisoners are being treated poorly in the IMU.	The OCO spoke with this individual in person on multiple occasions to gather more information regarding this concern. He declined to move forward with this concern.	Person Declined OCO Involvement

Washington Corrections Center

202.	External complainant reports that their loved one has been transferred due to being infraacted for something they did not do. The incarcerated person's infraction hearing has not yet been held.	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
203.	External person reported a complaint on behalf of an incarcerated person relating to dental care. The OCO reviewed DOC systems and found internal grievance process had not been initiated by the incarcerated person.	The OCO encouraged the incarcerated person to contact this office if they would like to request assistance after attempting to resolve with DOC internal processes. 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
204.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about their lawyer's conduct and the desire for OCO to investigate this in addition to their sentencing.	The OCO has declined to investigate this concern as per WAC 138-10-040(3)(a), the ombuds lacks jurisdiction over the complaint.	Declined
205.	External individual reports concern about an incarcerated person transferring to another facility.	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

Washington Corrections Center for Women

206.	Incarcerated person reports they have several negative Behavioral Observation Entries (BOEs) but were not notified of them until it was outside the appeal timeframe.	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 person filed a grievance but did not appeal up to level 2.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
207.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about their sentencing.	The OCO declined to investigate this concern as per WAC 138-10-040(3)(a) as the ombuds lacks jurisdiction over the complaint.	Declined

Washington State Penitentiary

208.	Incarcerated person reported a banking issue and is trying to assist a person who is not incarcerated get a refund.	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
------	---	--	-------------------------------------

209.	Incarcerated person reports they asked for a records review and staff refused. They also stated they then asked the facility through a different avenue and were able to review their records. Requested assistance with the staff behavior aspect of the complaint.	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. There are no Resolution Requests filed regarding the staff member named in DOC's system.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
210.	Incarcerated person reports they have an issue with a member of DOC and wants to have that person's job changed.	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
211.	Loved one expressed a desire for this office to retain video footage specifically for purpose of an incarcerated individual's pending litigation.	The OCO declined to investigate this concern as per WAC 138-10-040(3)(e) as the requested resolution is not within the ombuds' statutory power and authority.	Declined
212.	External person reports their loved one is not receiving the medications he was on in a non-DOC facility.	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

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

Case Closure Reason	Meaning
Unexpected Fatality Review	The incarcerated person died unexpectedly, and the death was reviewed by the unexpected fatality review team, as required by RCW 72.09.770.
Assistance Provided	The OCO achieved full or partial resolution of the person's complaint.
Information Provided	The OCO provided self-advocacy information.
DOC Resolved	DOC staff resolved the concern prior to OCO action.
Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate	Insufficient evidence existed to substantiate the concern.
No Violation of Policy	The OCO determined that DOC policy was not violated.
Substantiated	The OCO verified the concern but was unable to achieve a resolution to the concern.
Administrative Remedies Not Pursued	The incarcerated person did not yet pursue internal resolution per RCW 43.06C.040(2)(b).
Declined	The OCO declined to investigate the complaint per WAC 138-10-040(3).
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).
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.
Person Left DOC Custody	The incarcerated person left DOC custody prior to OCO action.

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

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