

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

<b>Case Closure Reason</b>	<b>Meaning</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Assistance Provided</b>	The OCO achieved full or partial resolution of the person's complaint.	31
<b>Information Provided</b>	The OCO provided self-advocacy information.	31
<b>DOC Resolved</b>	DOC staff resolved the concern prior to OCO action.	45
<b>Administrative Remedies Not Pursued</b>	The incarcerated person did not yet pursue internal resolution per RCW 43.06C.040(2)(b).	49
<b>Substantiated Without Resolution</b>	The OCO verified the concern but was unable to achieve a resolution to the concern.	15
<b>Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate</b>	Insufficient evidence existed to substantiate the concern.	22
<b>No Violation of Policy</b>	The OCO determined that DOC policy was not violated.	62
<b>Unexpected Fatality Review</b>	The incarcerated person died unexpectedly, and the death is under review.	0
<b>Person Left DOC Custody</b>	The incarcerated person left DOC custody prior to OCO action.	3
<b>Person Declined OCO Involvement</b>	The person did not want the OCO to pursue the concern or the OCO received no response to requests for more information.	2
<b>Lacked Jurisdiction</b>	The complaint did not meet OCO's jurisdictional requirements (typically when complaint is not about an incarcerated person or not about a DOC action).	5
<b>Declined</b>	The OCO declined to investigate because the complaint had already been investigated by this office.	0

# Monthly Outcome Report: April 2022

Institution of Incident	Complaint Summary	Outcome Summary	Case Closure Reason
<b>Airway Heights Corrections Center</b>			
1.	Person received an infraction and was sent to segregation. When the infraction was dismissed, he claims the officer who wrote the infraction began retaliating against him.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
2.	Person says they were infractioned following a mental health related incident with a staff member. Person says they were distraught and that this was the worst 24 hours in custody for them.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
3.	The patient reports breaking two staples from going up and down stairs after foot surgery. The individual is experiencing pain and requested pain management, medication, and physical therapy. He is currently in administrative segregation, where he was taken two days after he got back from the hospital. He is concerned the facility is trying to transfer him.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO alerted DOC medical and confirmed the patient was seen by an orthopedic specialist and referred to physical therapy. DOC reports physical therapy appointment delays in community and within DOC due to COVID and low levels of staffing across the healthcare field. DOC agreed to follow up with the patient after OCO outreach. The OCO verified that this patient's recent assessment shows healing, no remaining staples, and includes a pain management plan.	Assistance Provided
4.	Incarcerated Individual was notified before the facility COVID outbreak that they were approved for Graduated Re-Entry (GRE). All addresses for potential release were submitted and denied. The individual has not received a response to his requests for DOC transitional housing applications.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO finds that counselor services were delayed due to COVID-19 outbreaks. However, after the OCO's outreach to the facility, the incarcerated individual's counselor explained the actions she had completed and will continue to complete to process this person's Graduated Re-Entry (GRE) application. The OCO provided the counselor's updates to the incarcerated	Assistance Provided

individual.

5.	Individual wants to know if any behavioral observation entries (BOEs) were issued to him in the past two months that he was not made aware of.	The OCO provided self-advocacy information related to accessing BOEs through counselor.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
6.	Incarcerated individual states he had an infraction hearing and appealed the decision, but it was not the result he wanted. He believes the 752 infraction for possession of drugs is not appropriate for the situation as it was for a toilet paper roll found in the garbage.	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of DOC policy. The OCO reviewed the infraction packet and the hearing audio in which DOC states there is evidence to meet the possession of drug paraphernalia charge (752) per the DOC infraction guidelines. The incarcerated individual was originally infractioned for possession of drug paraphernalia (603) which is a Category A infraction. DOC then reduced the infraction to a Category B infraction. While the 752 infraction does not include the specific terminology of drug paraphernalia, DOC views the two toilet paper roll pipes as drug paraphernalia and the decision to reduce the 603 infraction to the lesser 752 is within DOC policy. The OCO advised the incarcerated individual that the decision by DOC to uphold the lower infraction is within DOC policy.	No Violation of Policy
7.	Family member expressed concern about incarcerated individual's custody plan recommendation because he feels he should not have been infractioned and sent to segregation. He received an infraction when he was trying to be helpful. He told staff that he does not have full control of his psychological and physical functions following an injury and if moved to the gym with a large group of individuals this could trigger the symptoms, which may result in him slapping someone. He was then moved to segregation and infractioned for making threats. He was then recommended for transfer to close custody. He does not want to transfer because his current facility is close to medical care and therapy he needs.	The OCO reviewed the infraction packet and contacted DOC facility leadership to further discuss this infraction. Because the incarcerated individual did not attend the infraction hearing and did not present medical information that would substantiate their involuntary reactions, there was no evidence of a defense for the infraction and the infraction was properly issued. DOC further indicated that his injury would not be considered "recent." As such, there was no evidence of a medical defense for the infraction and, conversely, evidence exists to substantiate the infraction.	No Violation of Policy
8.	Incarcerated Individual says that he	DOC resolved this concern prior to	DOC Resolved

was transferred to a facility where a person that had attempted to kill him was currently incarcerated. The incarcerated individual complainant states that he was demoted to a custody level that further endangered him. Incarcerated individual states that he has reoccurring trauma and is taking medication and the facility should have been aware of these issues prior to his transfer.

OCO involvement. The OCO reviewed the individual's facility plan and grievance related to this concern. The DOC resolution response states that at the time of the plan approval and transfer, a keep separate order was not in place. When DOC staff realized the problem, DOC moved the incarcerated individual complainant within the facility pending transfer to another facility.

9.	<p>Incarcerated individual states DOC staff took his sacred items box and asked him to remove the items. The incarcerated individual reports DOC told him the box would be sent to the chaplain but instead it was given to another incarcerated individual.</p>	<p>The OCO contacted the facility and reviewed a copy of the search report and the individual's property matrix. The individual was approved to have a religious item box and the search report showed the box was taken. The OCO then spoke with the chaplain who stated that the box was an old recreation plastic tote that had been reissued as a religious box with flawed plastic. As such, the chaplain reissued the incarcerated individual a new clear plastic tote at no charge and updated the property matrix. Additionally, the chaplain informed the OCO that the box was not being used solely for religious items, as it should be, but instead of infracting the individual for this the sergeant addressed the improper behavior with the incarcerated individual personally.</p>	DOC Resolved
10.	<p>Incarcerated individual states that his family filed an official misconduct claim with DOC headquarters and it was returned as a third-party complaint. The incarcerated individual thinks his involvement with the resolution program is being used against him, preventing his family from filing a complaint.</p>	<p>The OCO reviewed the individual's grievances from the past month and noted that he had more than five grievances open. This is a violation of the DOC resolution program requirements. In reviewing the grievances, the OCO found that DOC provided prompt and thorough answers to the grieved concerns. The OCO did not find any record of a misconduct claim that was submitted. The OCO advised the incarcerated individual that if he has evidence of said submitted claim to please provide a copy to this office so that the case may be reopened.</p>	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
11.	<p>Incarcerated individual states that a grievance he filed was found not grievable due to timeline. However,</p>	<p>The OCO contacted the facility regarding the grievance. Because the grievance occurred many months ago,</p>	Substantiated Without Resolution

the individual was told to wait until an investigation was completed by the unit supervisor.

there was not a resolution that could be provided now. The OCO advised the individual that if the issue is ongoing, he should alert staff or submit another grievance.

12.	Incarcerated Individual states their release date is incorrect in the system.	The OCO reviewed the grievances related to this concern and found that per RCW 9.94A.505(6), if time is being served on another charge, the credit will not be applied to another cause as that would be receiving credit for one date range twice.	No Violation of Policy
13.	Incarcerated individual had questions about a serious infraction related to a burnt toilet paper roll that was found in his cell. [This complaint was submitted by another individual involved in the same incident reported elsewhere in this report.]	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of DOC policy. The OCO reviewed the infraction packet and the hearing audio, in which DOC states there is evidence to meet the possession of drug paraphernalia charge (752) per the DOC infraction guidelines. The incarcerated individual was originally infraacted for possession of drug paraphernalia (603) which is a Category A infraction. DOC then reduced the infraction to a Category B infraction. While the 752 infraction does not include the specific terminology of drug paraphernalia, DOC views the two toilet paper roll pipes as drug paraphernalia and the decision to reduce the 603 infraction to the lesser 752 is within DOC policy.	No Violation of Policy
14.	Incarcerated individual states that his facility plan is not being approved. He states he has enough points to be in minimum custody but DOC keeps conducting cell searches and not giving him a job. He states that DOC claims he is on drugs but he has offered to drug test several times. He feels DOC is trying to set him up and is harassing him.	The OCO reviewed the individual's custody plan and found that the plan was recently updated. Additionally, the number of points the individual has places him in medium custody.	No Violation of Policy
15.	Incarcerated individual has an infraction concern in which he believes his words were twisted and the reason he was infraacted was not what he actually said.	The OCO reviewed the infraction packet and appeal documentation. There is evidence to substantiate the infraction based on staff testimony which meets the "some evidence" standard that is required to uphold DOC infractions.	No Violation of Policy
16.	Incarcerated individual states he appealed an infraction and it was reduced; however, he still lost good time credits. The individual would	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO reviewed the hearing audio, infraction	No Violation of Policy

	like the infraction dropped completely.	packet and sanctions and found that DOC reduced the sanctions for good conduct time per DOC prison sanctioning guidelines when the infraction was reduced.	
17.	Incarcerated individual states that a CUS heard and found him guilty of category C and B infractions, even though a CUS is only allowed to hear category D infractions per DOC 460.000.	The OCO reviewed the infraction packets and substantiated that a CUS had conducted the hearings for the two infractions the individual identified. However, DOC 460.000 identifies Correctional Unit Supervisors as the primary hearing officers for Category D infractions, but this does not preclude them from conducting other hearings. As a result, both infraction hearings were conducted according to policy.	No Violation of Policy
18.	Staff are not wearing masks on third shift at the mainline outside or on certain units. DOC responded to a fight two days ago and they did not have a mask on when they came into the unit. They even conduct pat searches with no masks.	The individual had not yet pursued internal resolution as required by RCW 43.06C. This office provided self-advocacy information regarding Resolution Program via hotline.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
19.	Incarcerated individual was asked to give a urinary analysis test (UA) and could not produce one. He was being treated for a urinary tract infection (UTI) at the time of the requested UA and received an infraction even though the medical paperwork was provided for the hearing officer.	The OCO was unable to identify a violation of policy. The OCO reviewed the infraction packet and found there is evidence to substantiate the 607 failure to produce a UA infraction as the individual was no longer being treated for a UTI at the time of the infraction, as confirmed by medical.	No Violation of Policy
20.	The incarcerated individual states his video visits with his wife were permanently terminated due to several suspensions prior, including her taking a photo of him, one because she was wearing leggings, and another because she used his daughter's account to see him. He reports the incidents were last year, and his family lives in another state so video visits are the only way to see his family. He states his wife and children are his only support during his time incarcerated and that his family tried to put in a request for an in person visit but they were never responded to.	The OCO spoke with DOC staff regarding the suspension of the video visits. The video visits were suspended due to repeated violations of the video visit policy as set forth in DOC 450.300, including multiple sexually explicit video visits, in which three warnings were issued before the suspension. Additionally, the individual's wife is an approved visitor for in-person visits. The OCO found no violation of DOC policy regarding the video and in-person visits.	No Violation of Policy
21.	Incarcerated individual states that the law library has been inaccessible for two years, which causes a denial of access to books and materials	The OCO reviewed the individual's grievances related to this concern. The OCO substantiated that the law libraries have been closed without a	Substantiated Without Resolution

	from the state libraries.	planned reopening date; however, due to the uncertainty of the COVID pandemic, the facility is unable to provide an expected opening date at this time.	
22.	Person says that while on a confidential call with the Ombuds office another voice could be heard on the line, and this violates the confidentiality.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. Because OCO calls are not recorded, there is no way to substantiate this happened.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
23.	Incarcerated individual has been in a single cell for most of their incarceration and they would like to go back to a single cell.	The OCO provided information regarding how to request to be screened for a single cell. The OCO reviewed the incarcerated individual's central file and found that his last screening for a single cell was in 2015.	Information Provided
24.	External family member of an incarcerated individual reports that people housed at AHCC do not have access to call the Office of the Corrections Ombuds (OCO) hotline.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO worked with the facility to independently confirm that people housed at AHCC can successfully place calls to the OCO hotline. The OCO explained to the external family member how incarcerated people can contact our office.	Assistance Provided
25.	Person reports that DOC says they are going to drive him to a community corrections office at the time of his release. He says he has no supervision and should be able to just walk out of AHCC.	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
26.	The incarcerated individual was moved from minimum custody to medium custody because of the COVID quarantine protocols. This person's religious practices are available to them in the minimum custody unit, and because they are still in medium custody, they cannot practice their religious beliefs.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO reviewed this person's location and determined that this person had moved back to the unit they wanted.	DOC Resolved
27.	Incarcerated person was placed into the main facility for COVID quarantine in February and has not been transferred back to camp. Everyone else that was at camp has been transferred.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to OCO action. OCO's review determined that the incarcerated individual is no longer in quarantine and has returned to their original housing assignment.	DOC Resolved
28.	Incarcerated individual reports retaliation and harassment by a named DOC staff member. The	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO worked with DOC	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate

	individual reports that the DOC staff member yelled at the individual and treats her differently than other incarcerated individuals.	staff to ensure that the incarcerated individual has access to report concerns with DOC staff and tools to work with others when she is experiencing conflict.	
29.	External family member of an incarcerated individual is concerned about accessing supplies to fix their incarcerated loved one's wheelchair. The incarcerated individual owns his own wheelchair, but the front wheel is broken. DOC has not assisted him getting access to purchase a new part to fix the wheel.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO obtained information about how an incarcerated individual can initiate the process of accessing new parts to fix the broken medical equipment. DOC explained that the incarcerated individual will request a form titled "Offender-Paid Durable Medical Equipment (DME)" from unit or medical staff. The incarcerated individual will then fill out the top half of the document requesting the supplies they need, in this case new wheels. Then, the purchase will be assessed and approved by DOC staff. Once approved, the incarcerated individual will receive the equipment to fix the wheels and DOC will provide tools and assistance to get the new wheels installed. The OCO provided the incarcerated individual and his family with this information and the form needed to request the medical parts.	Assistance Provided
30.	Incarcerated individual has been approved for transfer to another facility. However, he has not transferred and has spent months in the Special Management Unit (SMU) at Airway Heights Corrections Center (AHCC). He would like to be transferred immediately.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO found that DOC approved a transfer in November; however, his extended placement in the Special Management Unit (SMU) was due to the protocols DOC put into place to mitigate COVID-19 spread during outbreaks. The OCO confirmed that this person was transferred.	No Violation of Policy
31.	Family of an incarcerated individual reports that the medication-assisted treatment (MAT) programming has been impacted by the COVID-19 restrictions and staffing shortages at the facility. The family member is concerned that the incarcerated individual will release from prison without starting his medication-assisted treatment program.	The OCO was able to substantiate this concern but was not able to achieve a resolution. The OCO confirmed that the medication-assisted treatment program was impacted during the COVID-19 outbreaks within DOC. Incarcerated individuals already enrolled in the medication-assisted treatment program continued to receive treatment; however, all new applications for treatment were not enrolled during this time, which would not provide this individual with	Substantiated Without Resolution

access to the program.

32.	Family members expressed concern that their loved one's earned release date was the day of the call, and because he is on quarantine status he is not being released.	The OCO reviewed the person's release plan and noted that the release address was holding his spot. This office asked DOC staff to inform the incarcerated individual that his bed would be held while under quarantine. DOC staff then relayed that information to the individual.	Assistance Provided
33.	Incarcerated individual reports that their counselor has not helped them with their release. The result is that he is being held in prison past his Earned Release Date (ERD).	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO reviewed the release plan and found that it is in progress and in compliance with DOC 350.200 Transition and Release. Recent plans have been denied delaying this process and the incarcerated individual has not been responding to requests for updates from his counselor to further process the release plans.	No Violation of Policy
34.	During a series of transfers from two facilities on the east side of the state to a facility on the west, an individual's property was lost and they have been informed that there is nothing more that can be done to locate it.	The OCO provided information regarding filing a tort claim with the Department of Enterprise Services.	Information Provided
35.	Incarcerated individual states he was infracted for fighting (505) and has concerns about the evidence and hearing process. He also feels that the sanctions he received were excessive given that it was his first infraction.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO reviewed the infraction packet and hearing audio. Based on the evidence photos, there is evidence to substantiate the infraction. The sanctions were not only within policy but below the standard range for a first-time offense. The dates were listed properly and within policy.	No Violation of Policy
36.	Individual wants DOC to create a process to allow people with noted medical issues to get a new mattress at an expedited rate. The person has back issues and medical issues related to poor quality mattress and a new mattress would help these issues.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
37.	Incarcerated individual requests legal access to respond to the court of appeals while in medical isolation.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO confirmed that	DOC Resolved

The individual has two days to respond to the decision, but staff told him that there is nothing they can do assist him access the courts.

DOC allowed the individual legal access to meet the court deadline.

**Cedar Creek Corrections Center**

38.	A family member of an incarcerated individual reports concerns related to her loved one trying to be relieved of their job duties at Department of Natural Resources (DNR) due to medical issues that make the job duties difficult to perform.	The OCO provided information regarding how to remove themselves from the DNR employment position. The OCO provided step-by-step guidance on the process to be removed from the DNR work crew. This information included the removal steps for medical and non-medical reasons.	Information Provided
39.	Person reports currently being housed in the chapel living with 15 other people on cots. They are not socially distanced. There is one bathroom/shower available to them, and that bathroom is also used by another group of 15 people housed nearby. DOC policy states that there should be one toilet per six people.	OCO contacted facility leadership to ensure their awareness of this concern. This office provided information to the complainant regarding how to access grievance forms during quarantine.	Information Provided
40.	Incarcerated individual reports that he was denied release and now will be held past his Earned Release Date (ERD) due to this.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The DOC denied this release plan in compliance with DOC 350.200 and DOC 390.300. There were concerns reported to DOC about this person releasing back into the county requested in the denied plan. A new release plan was approved in a different county.	No Violation of Policy
41.	Person was infraacted for allegedly intimidating a staff member. He explains that he was simply trying to follow a directive from one staff member to exit the area, but then another staff member pushed him and told him to go sit down. He was getting multiple directives that were not consistent and does not think he should have been infraacted for this.	The OCO reviewed the disciplinary record for this infraction and was unable to substantiate any violations of policy. Even though the individual offered several witness statements claiming that he was not being aggressive or intimidating, the infraction turned on whether the infracting staff felt intimidated in the moment. DOC offered staff statements that supported that assertion, and thus met its burden of evidence to support the infraction.	No Violation of Policy
42.	Person currently works for Department of Natural Resources. Person says that the job is causing them health problems and they have been to medical several times to request a Health Status Report	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to OCO action. The OCO confirmed with DOC that the incarcerated individual did see medical and was allowed to change jobs.	DOC Resolved

allowing them to change jobs. They have also tried to talk to multiple staff who are not willing to release them from the job and allow a job change.

Clallam Bay Corrections Center			
43.	Incarcerated individual was cleared to attend the funeral of his brother. He was transported three hours to the event. However, before he could attend the funeral, the transport turned around and told him there was a security issue.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO confirmed with DOC that threats were made to harm the incarcerated individual and the transport officers if he attended the funeral. This information was reported to DOC by law enforcement during transport. The cost of the furlough trip was not charged to the payee and the family was contacted at the time of the incident.	No Violation of Policy
44.	Person says that they collaterally came into contact with pepper spray and the only thing staff did to remedy the situation was to turn on fans which further spread the spray and made things worse. Person says they have asthma and could not breathe.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
45.	Incarcerated individual reports that DOC returned a TV that his family bought because he was placed in the Intensive Management Unit (IMU) shortly after the TV was purchased.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. According to DOC 450.120 Packages for Offenders, vendor packages cannot be received while housed in the Regional Health Unit or in IMU. This office confirmed that the person did receive a TV after he was transferred out of IMU.	No Violation of Policy
46.	Patient reports DOC plans to move him from his current facility and the individual is concerned about accessing care for certain medical issues at a different facility. DOC headquarters has decided to transfer him to CRCC, which has minimal medical and is 45 minutes from the nearest hospital. This person does not believe CRCC has adequate access to hospitals and care for his conditions.	The OCO alerted DOC Health Services staff. The OCO's review substantiated that the patient was transferred. The medical team at both sending and receiving facilities reviewed the patient records and conditions, and report the facility has the ability to meet his medical needs and there is no restriction on his placement there related to medical care. DOC is following the Health Plan, and there is no violation of policy. DOC reports the patient is now refusing medical care.	No Violation of Policy
47.	The incarcerated individual is	DOC staff resolved this concern prior	DOC Resolved

	concerned that their unit cannot have contact visits like other units at his facility have. The individual would like equal opportunity for visiting.	to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO learned that DOC approved visitation for this unit.	
48.	Incarcerated individual reports DOC created a plan for him to be moved out of the Intensive Management Unit (IMU) however, after the plan was finalized, he was made aware that DOC placed a keep separate on him and another individual housed in the unit DOC was planning to transfer him to. Now he will not be able to release from IMU and requests OCO review the incident to assist him in releasing from IMU.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. DOC did not plan to move this individual into the unit until the other individual with the keep separate was transferred out of the unit. The reporting individual was moved from IMU and placed in their desired unit soon after the transfer of the individual for whom they had a keep separate order.	DOC Resolved
49.	Incarcerated individual reports he was ordered a typewriter and it was delivered to the facility where he is housed. However, the individual was in the Intensive Management Unit (IMU) when the typewriter arrived. The individual reports that he was released from IMU and the typewriter was still at the facility but DOC sent it back nonetheless and kept the \$15 hold fee for the typewriter. The individual would like the \$15 back.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. According to DOC 450.120, vendor packages cannot be received while housed in the Regional Health Unit or while in the Intensive Management Unit (IMU). DOC states the item was returned during his stay in IMU and the \$15 holding fee was refunded as the typewriter was broken.	No Violation of Policy
50.	The incarcerated individual reports they are being denied a TV and access to commissary items. They have grieved this concern and were told it is a nongrievable issue.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO contacted the DOC about this concern. The DOC reported that the restrictive housing unit only provides privileges at specified levels.	No Violation of Policy
51.	Incarcerated individual reports a Correctional Officer (CO) working in the facility chapel wrote a negative Behavior Observation Entry (BOE) on him that was not issued to him at the time the BOE was drafted per DOC 300.010 Behavior Observations. The individual later discovered the BOE and appealed it to the Correctional Program Manager (CPM). The appeal was not considered and the BOE is still on the individual's central file.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. DOC staff reported they attempted to present the complainant with the BOE, but he rejected it. DOC has also said the behavior observation is written in compliance with DOC 300.010 Behavior Observations and will not be removed or changed.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
52.	Individual declared a mental health emergency and said CBCC staff and medical failed to follow procedure. He received an infraction and is in segregation.	DOC resolved prior to OCO involvement. OCO reviewed the level 3 grievance response. The Deputy Director had agreed that the on duty mental health staff should have been	DOC Resolved

consulted at the time of this incident. Medical staff was asked to review staff procedures. The infraction from the incident was dismissed and is no longer on the incarcerated individual's record. He is scheduled to transfer to a different facility, which was part of his resolution request.

53.	This person and 22 other people were injected with the wrong medication.	The OCO was able to substantiate this concern, but was not able to achieve a resolution. The OCO was able to substantiate that these individuals were given the incorrect medication. The DOC provided them with information regarding the medication received and provided opportunities to report adverse side effects to medical staff.	Substantiated Without Resolution
54.	The incarcerated person reports while housed in the Intensive Management Unit (IMU) their property was sitting out in the foyer. This resulted in the some of the individual's property being lost.	The OCO provided information regarding locating the missing property or filing a tort claim to potentially receive compensation for the lost items. The OCO provided step-by-step guidance on how to resolve their property concerns. The directions included details on how to attempt to track down their property and how to file a tort claim if the property could not be found.	Information Provided
55.	Incarcerated individual reports unit staff in his unit are denying him and fellow incarcerated individuals housed this unit adequate access to law library in violation of DOC 590.500 Legal Access for Incarcerated Individuals and the resolution coordinator is furthering this violation by refusing to process complaints.	The OCO provided assistance. The resolution request filed by the individual regarding legal access was denied resolution investigation when it does meet the criteria to be investigated through the resolution process. The OCO requested DOC reopen this resolution request or allow the individual to file a new resolution request regarding legal access. DOC agreed and subsequently reopened the request.	Assistance Provided
56.	Individual reports that staff refused to move an individual to close observation area (COA) after reporting intentions to self-harm. Staff left individual alone in cell and he attempted suicide. Individual is concerned DOC staff did not follow policy in responding to the mental health emergency and self-harm.	The OCO was unable to substantiate that DOC ignored this incarcerated individual's emergency. The OCO contacted the superintendent regarding this concern and asked for a review of the incident. The video was saved and reviewed. It was substantiated that the nurse on duty was notified at the time of the incident and an emergent cell entry was made.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
57.	Incarcerated individual reports the	The OCO was unable to identify	No Violation of

	<p>mailroom has been making copies of his incoming mail and throwing away the original mail. The mailroom staff is also not responding to an appeal and the individual reports the Mailroom had an inadequate response to another mail rejection appeal.</p>	<p>evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. DOC headquarters directed mailroom staff to begin making copies of the incoming mail to mitigate incoming contraband coming in through the mail. The OCO confirmed that the mail rejection appeal was adequately answered. The mail was rejected for having another incarcerated individual's information in it which is not allowed per DOC 450.100 Mail for Individuals in Prison. The OCO assisted in ensuring that the individual received a response back from DOC regarding the mail rejection appeal.</p>	<p>Policy</p>
58.	<p>Incarcerated individual reports DOC staff are possibly violating policy by frequently rejecting his mail.</p>	<p>The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO finds DOC rejected the mail in compliance with DOC 590.500(III)(A)(3) Legal Access for Incarcerated Individuals which states that individuals will not possess legal materials containing information about another incarcerated person in Washington State.</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy</p>
59.	<p>Incarcerated individual and others went to receive their second COVID-19 vaccine but were given the wrong medication. The individuals were given monoclonal antibodies instead of the COVID-19 vaccine.</p>	<p>The OCO was able to substantiate this concern but was not able to achieve a resolution. The OCO was able to substantiate that the individuals were given the incorrect medication. The DOC provided them with information regarding the medication received and provided opportunities to report adverse side effects to medical staff.</p>	<p>Substantiated Without Resolution</p>
60.	<p>Incarcerated individual reports multiple unit staff refused to help him access medical attention during a medical emergency. The individual has been having ongoing chest pains and this night the pains had worsened, so he pressed his emergency button to alert DOC staff he needed help, but no DOC staff responded. A staff person came near the individual's cell and he flagged him to declare a medical emergency. The staff told the individual he would not help him. DOC staff working the unit booth did not respond to him. He was finally assisted by a sergeant.</p>	<p>This person was released prior to the OCO taking action on the complaint.</p>	<p>Person Left DOC Custody Prior to OCO Action</p>

The individual requests OCO investigate the DOC staff that did not help him access medical care.

61.	This person and 22 other people were injected with the wrong medication.	The OCO was able to substantiate this concern, but was not able to achieve a resolution. The OCO was able to substantiate they were given the incorrect medication. The DOC provided them with information regarding the medication received and provided opportunities to report adverse side effects to medical staff.	Substantiated Without Resolution
62.	Individual says they will be getting a program in the Intensive Management Unit and wants to do it at CBCC where they know mental health staff. The officers are treating them well in IMU and they do not want to leave. Person is concerned about transfer to another facility.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
63.	This person and 22 other people were injected with the wrong medication.	The OCO was able to substantiate this concern, but was not able to achieve a resolution. The OCO was able to substantiate they were given the incorrect medication. The DOC provided them with information regarding the medication received and provided opportunities to report adverse side effects to medical staff.	Substantiated Without Resolution

### Coyote Ridge Corrections Center

64.	Family reports patient is not receiving adequate access to insulin, specialist prescribed items, and appointments. Meal and medication delivery have been delayed and separated by hours, impacting insulin patients.	The OCO alerted DOC medical, substantiated delayed meal deliveries due to COVID outbreaks, movement, and low staffing numbers. Healthcare reports adding snacks to nurse carts so patients will have food with medications regardless of the kitchen schedule and delivery. The OCO received updates via family and contacted DOC about those concerns as well. This office substantiated unit medication delivery delays and confirmed the patient also received specialist appointment.	Assistance Provided
65.	An external family member reported that their loved one did not have access to the resolution program to grieve that he was being sent to the IMU after testing positive for COVID-19 and would not have access to his TV or tablet. He asked to file a	The OCO provided assistance by contacting the facility to request that staff ensure that all units had access to grievance forms. DOC staff agreed and took action to ensure availability of forms.	Assistance Provided

resolution request but was told he was not able to do so.

66.	Incarcerated individual reports that she must undress with other individuals when preparing for work. She states she is getting abused and harassed because of the requirement to remove her undergarments every day. She filed a grievance the day of the OCO hotline case intake.	The OCO reviewed the concern and contacted the facility to discuss this concern. The facility provided the incarcerated individual with the option to come to work last so that no one would be in the changing area so that she could change alone. The facility also stated that this alternative arrangement would be available for this individual in any subsequent job. However, the individual chose to quit the job instead of using this offered solution.	DOC Resolved
67.	The incarcerated individual purchased some books, and they were told that they could not have them. The individual requested that the books be sent back and they were charged for that service. The books still have not been sent back to the vendor.	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
68.	Incarcerated individual states that staff members are issuing excessive infractions. He received a second infraction in four days for the same thing. He and a group of individuals in the area are being issued infractions excessively. He states that he does not have a history of infractions and is not sure why this is suddenly happening to him and others in the unit.	The OCO reviewed the individual's infraction history and only found one infraction. However, because the individual did not appeal this, per RCW 43.06C.040, the OCO was unable to further investigate this concern. The OCO also provided the individual with directions on how to appeal a future infraction.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
69.	The individual is at the last several months of a 10+ year sentence. They were supposed to take a class, had an interview, and was told he did not need to take a class. He checked in every 6 months to make sure that he did not need the class. His counselor also recently said that he did not need this 18-month class. He now has a new counselor who says he must take this class which requires him to move to another facility. The individual will now have to be there for an extra year to complete the class. The counselor will not give him any information.	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
70.	The incarcerated individual was moved to a different unit during	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a	No Violation of Policy

	close-contact quarantine. They were not allowed to pack their property and had to wait for it to be packed by staff and brought to them. The property never made it to them and they were forced to stay in isolation without their TV.	violation of policy by DOC. The DOC implemented policies to address COVID-19 conditions within the facilities. The OCO was not able to determine the DOC actions in this case were outside of the DOC policies such that an investigation could be initiated.	
71.	Patient reports not receiving a follow up with a provider after starting hormone replacement therapy. She received blood draws but did not see a provider and is not getting responses on kites. Patient would like to discuss labs, levels, and care with provider. She is also experiencing issues with refill timing.	The OCO provided assistance. This office alerted the DOC Health Service Manager of these concerns and then confirmed that a follow up appointment with provider to discuss lab results had occurred. DOC also agreed to schedule an additional follow up for any ongoing questions or concerns after OCO outreach.	Assistance Provided
72.	Person states his Custody Unit Supervisor was told by the Superintendent that the OCO tried to send him two letters that were returned, then he tried to have the person sign a multiple-choice release of confidentiality.	The OCO confirmed there were no open cases for incarcerated individual and relayed this information to the incarcerated person.	Information Provided
73.	Person states they were incorrectly quarantined after clearing from isolation for COVID. They believe CRCC was not following protocol necessary to get more COVID relief funding from the federal government.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
74.	Incarcerated individual states that he has been in segregation for several months awaiting transfer to another facility and he has not been given any updates on why it is taking so long to transfer.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The incarcerated individual transferred to the new facility before the OCO reviewed this concern. As a result, it appears their concern was addressed by DOC when the transfer was completed.	DOC Resolved
75.	The patient reports having surgery and being told medical would cover specialized shoes/insoles; DOC later denied specialized shoes/insoles. Patient also reports provider was dismissive of his concerns and felt that he was being interrogated during care. He reports that while the provider does provide care, it is difficult to get him to act.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO alerted DOC medical; DOC reports offering Health Plan approved supportive rocker bottom shoe, per patient prescription. The OCO confirmed the patient has a Health Status Report (HSR) for Durable Medical Equipment (DME - two insoles and shoes) and is scheduled with an offsite orthotic specialist as	No Violation of Policy

well as a follow up.

76.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about confusion regarding a TV he previously purchased but has not successfully transferred with him. There was conflicting information from DOC about where the TV was located and whether the individual could have it.	The OCO provided assistance. This office contacted the grievance coordinator regarding the original grievance about the TV. After inquiring with the coordinator, DOC staff made further contact within the facility and the TV was located at the individual's previous facility. DOC will transfer the TV to the individual as soon as he completes the postage transfer.	Assistance Provided
77.	Person reports they are in minimum custody mixed with medium custody people. DOC does rapid testing but does not quarantine the people before they enter them into the unit. Individual wants DOC to hold people until they have a negative test at least. They want to know how to help people who may feel endangered by medium security individuals.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
78.	Person states that he passed a urinary test (UA) but failed the breathalyzer. During the test, he states that he does not believe DOC followed policy when DOC did the breathalyzer. He also feels the loss of good conduct time is excessive for a first major infraction. The policy he feels is violated includes DOC not doing a mouth check, not showing results of breathalyzer or taking pictures.	The OCO reviewed the infraction packet and hearing audio and found that there was evidence to substantiate the infraction for a positive test for intoxicating substances (752) when the individual received a .049 BAC result on the breathalyzer. No policy was violated by DOC as it is not required that staff conduct a mouth check or take a photo of the test results. Lastly, the loss of good conduct time is within DOC sanctions guidelines.	No Violation of Policy
79.	The incarcerated individual reports he is not getting paid in full due to staff retaliation. He filed a staff conduct grievance because an officer was not turning count lights off, and now believes the same staff member is impacting his paycheck. The individual worked weekends for a month and did not get paid for those days. Pay is also supposed to be increased from Incarcerated Individuals Betterment Fund (IIBF) but his recent paycheck does not reflect the pay increase like other workers' paychecks did.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
80.	Family member expressed concerns about the facility mailroom and	The OCO reviewed the incarcerated individual's grievances and see that	Administrative Remedies Not

	potential retaliation related to the mailroom conduct.	they have not grieved the mailroom conduct or staff for potential retaliation to a level two response. The OCO advised the incarcerated individual that they must pursue internal resolution per RCW 43.06C.040(2)(b) before the OCO is able to investigate the case. Because they did not file a grievance or mail appeal, the OCO was unable to further investigate this concern.	Pursued
81.	Patient reports continued issues with screws in his jaw that are moving around when he talks. There are already three titanium screws missing and he is seeking repairs. He has had several infections in his mouth and says DOC have not treated but can see them on x-rays.	The OCO alerted DOC dental, Health Service Manager and Facility Medical Director. Attaching or repairing fixed appliances to implants is not covered under the WA DOC Health Plan. Alternative care plan is available; DOC discussed with the patient but this was refused by the patient. Patient may follow up with provider or via kite if they have changed their mind. "Offender Paid Health Plan" is the only option that covers the specific dental care he is requesting. DOC medical does not find permanent antibiotics safe and therefore discontinued the prescription.	No Violation of Policy
82.	Incarcerated individual states he won at his infraction hearing but he was terminated from his porter job as a result. Now that the infraction is gone, he states that no one has answers about how he can get his job back. He was infractioned for losing his job and lost the job because of other dismissed infractions.	The OCO contacted the incarcerated individual to clarify the concern. When the OCO opened this case, the individual's infraction appeal had not been completed by DOC yet. The OCO waited until the infraction appeal was entered to begin work on this case. As a result of the individual's appeal DOC dismissed the entirety of the infraction and there was no OCO involvement needed.	DOC Resolved
83.	Incarcerated individual expressed concern about an infraction and states that he is being held hostage in administrative segregation and is in fear of his life. He thinks that the Associate Superintendent is holding back his appeal because his appeal may incriminate the staff.	The OCO reviewed the infraction packet and hearing audio, including numerous DOC messages regarding this matter and find the elements of the harassing staff (896) infraction were substantiated.	No Violation of Policy
84.	The individual has been approved for camp, but they need to stay at their current facility in order to access the law library.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO confirmed incarcerated individual had access to law library.	DOC Resolved
85.	Person signed up for a biohazard bloodborne pathogen class, Custody	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this	Administrative Remedies Not

Unit Supervisor filed paperwork for person to get paid hazmat porter pay but told the individual he would have to grieve it to get paid.	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.	Pursued
--	--	---------

**Larch Corrections Center**

86.	The incarcerated individual says that many staff members are biased against Black individuals at the facility and use derogatory language. He has tried to file grievances about this issue, but says he was told by the grievance coordinator that he is retaliating against staff and they will send his information to headquarters if he grieves staff conduct again.	The individual did not receive disciplinary action, nor has he filed any new resolution requests pertaining to this complaint. The OCO has reviewed the incarcerated individual's resolution request history, and found he filed several grievances regarding staff misconduct in a short time. Per DOC 550.100, resolution requests filed in excess or in retaliation may result in disciplinary action.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
87.	The individual reports that when someone gets caught abusing an electrical outlet, they screw down the plate so that no one can use the outlets, which means that they cannot use their clippers.	The OCO provided assistance. This office alerted DOC staff to this concern. DOC later verified that staff and tier representatives are working on a solution for outlets being covered due to tampering. In the meantime, individuals can schedule appointments with the barber at no cost.	Assistance Provided
88.	Incarcerated individual has infraction issues that he was told in 2020 that the OCO could not help with. The infraction for making alcohol (655) is very concerning to him, because of his upcoming GRE decision.	The OCO reviewed the infraction packet. The alcohol substance was found in the common area of the dayroom, where the individual's housing assignment was due to COVID protocol. Despite another individual claiming possession, because the contraband was found in the common area, this would be a "cell-tag" in which all who have access to the common area can be infringed.	No Violation of Policy
89.	Person requests access to programming completion records for a 2022 court date.	The OCO provided self-advocacy information to complainant. Self-advocacy information is step-by-step guidance for the complainant to go about resolving his/her/their own complaint. Closing letter includes step-by-step information for obtaining records of completed programming.	Information Provided
90.	Person says they caught COVID and although considered recovered by medical, they are still coughing and	Upon initial intake of the case, the OCO advised the individual file a resolution request about the concern.	Assistance Provided

having trouble breathing and do not feel that they are fit to work at their job on Department of Natural Resources (DNR) in this condition. Medical prescribed an inhaler to treat the symptoms but it was not effective. Person is concerned that it is almost fire season and it would make it very difficult to work with a mask while still sick and coughing.

OCO staff then assisted the person in drafting the grievance. The individual ultimately received a response from DOC that thoroughly addressed all of their concerns.

91.	Incarcerated individual states that he was transferred out of Larch for two failure to program infractions. He does not understand why he received two infractions. He appealed both and they were both upheld.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO investigated the infraction packets and appeals for both of the concerns. There is sufficient evidence to uphold both infractions as the individual chose not to go to work on two separate days and was infraacted accordingly.	No Violation of Policy
92.	The individual's counselor contacted the landlord of the place he is releasing to and said that before he can be released the counselor must talk to the landlord. The incarcerated individual believes that the counselor was overstepping in contacting the landlord and he also believes it is not in policy to do so.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO reviewed policy pertaining to transfer to GRE and found that the policy permits DOC to contact the landlord of the residence where the individual will be transferring to.	No Violation of Policy
93.	Person says he has six months left in therapeutic community, is not on DOSA, will not be on community custody, and will be released homeless. He is required to register as a level 1 "sex offender" but if he is released homeless he will have to register at level 3 which will make getting a job or a place to live even more difficult. He is also concerned about being released homeless to a county where he had connections to individuals who were not a good influence on him previously.	Incarcerated individual was given correct information regarding their eligibility for housing vouchers. OCO communicated with DOC staff to confirm incarcerated individual discussed re-entry planning and OCO provided alternative housing resources.	No Violation of Policy

**Mission Creek Corrections Center for Women**

94.	Incarcerated person received an infraction for violating cell confinement. According to the incarcerated person, the hearing officer on the infraction said that the DOC would not find the incarcerated person guilty depending on what the	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO reviewed the infraction, hearing, and sanctions. The hearing audio did not contain a statement from the hearing officer committing to a "not guilty"	No Violation of Policy
-----	--	--	------------------------

hearing officer saw on the surveillance video. However, the incarcerated person was still found guilty after the hearing officer reviewed the relevant video. The incarcerated person felt this was unfair.

finding depending on the contents of the surveillance video. Regardless of any commitment made by the hearing officer, the surveillance video likely would not have invalidated the infraction, because it showed the incarcerated person violating cell confinement. The incarcerated person's hearing rights were observed, and sanctions were within policy for the infraction.

**Monroe Correctional Complex**

95.		The incarcerated individual had asked to attend AA meetings and church. Since their time of arrival they have been denied these services by their counselor.	The OCO was able to substantiate this concern but was not able to achieve a resolution. Per the Governor's State of Emergency Order, programming has been shut down since March of 2020, which is why this person has not had access to church and AA meetings.	Substantiated Without Resolution
96.		Individual received an infraction from an interaction with a staff member. Individual believes the infraction could have been retaliatory after other actions he had taken. Individual's loved one stated that the infracting staff behaved inappropriately, and made comments that could have put the individual in danger.	OCO investigated the individual's infraction. There is not a clear nexus between a protected behavior and a negative action to support a claim of retaliation. Despite a lack of retained video evidence, staff statements are sufficient for DOC's low standard of evidence. DOC did not violate policy in upholding this infraction.	No Violation of Policy
97.	Intensive Management Unit	Individual has received infractions for behaviors related to his mental health disorder and is in segregation.	This individual will be moved to a different facility and will not receive a custody demotion. They are currently awaiting transfer in the transfer pod.	DOC Resolved
98.	Washington State Reformatory Unit	Complainant's incarcerated loved one tested positive for COVID and was moved to WSR. He was informed that his property would be packed up and brought over the next day. No personal property or scheduled commissary was delivered to WSR as expected. Loved one states that incarcerated person experienced a significant distress from continuous dismissal of expressed concerns, being forced to live in less than desirable conditions while ill, and feeling he had no control over his health or wellbeing.	The OCO was able to confirm the individual was moved due to COVID and did not have property. The individual has now been moved back to the original living unit. DOC implemented policies to address COVID-19 conditions within the facilities. The OCO was not able to determine the DOC actions in this case were outside of the DOC policies.	No Violation of Policy
99.		Patient was transferred to TRU to receive an outside clinic visit that has not happened yet. It has been over	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO contacted DOC	DOC Resolved

	six months.	and confirmed that an appointment for an outside visit is scheduled.	
100.	Washington State Reformatory Person says that due to lack of staff at Washington State Reformatory, no one is allowed to use the religious activities building besides Native Americans. Everyone else must use another building.	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
101.	Person is requesting an investigation into the Monroe Correctional Complex - Special Offender Unit, Close Observation for discriminating against and violating the constitutional rights of incarcerated people with mental illness.	The OCO provided assistance by planning an onsite visit to the units listed in the concern. OCO could not find evidence of a violation of individual's rights. The incarcerated individual was transferred after the concern was filed.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
102.	The incarcerated individual reports that DOC wants them to take Thinking for a Change. They do not know why they need to take it or why DOC waited nine years to tell them they needed it. This is keeping them from being eligible for camp.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO reviewed this individual's records and found nothing in this person's facility plan or programming narrative stating that they need to take Thinking for a Change.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
103.	The incarcerated individual reports that DOC is removing "privacy screens" previously used during COVID outbreaks. They would like these screens to remain in place.	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
104.	Washington State Reformatory Unit Incarcerated patient believes his implanted medical device is failing.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO contacted DOC and confirmed the provider saw the patient and they are moving forward with treating this person's medical concern. The Facility Medical Director is monitoring the matter.	DOC Resolved
105.	The incarcerated individual reported to staff that someone wanted to hurt them. Nothing was done, and they were attacked the next day.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO contacted the DOC about this concern. DOC staff denied having any prior knowledge of threats towards this individual. Because the no evidence exists which could substantiate this communication, the OCO is unable to	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate

substantiate the individual's concern.

106.	The incarcerated individual reports that they requested staff to inventory their property before they transfer to their new facility. They are concerned some of their items will be missing.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO contacted the DOC about this concern. DOC staff verified that the Intensive Management Unit does not inventory property; instead the property will be packed up and inventoried at the sending facility.	DOC Resolved
107.	Incarcerated individual reports ongoing retaliation from the CUS. The CUS put his information out on the tier which jeopardizes his safety because he said he does not like him. He is now being told he is going to be transferred out because of minor infraction even though it is under appeal. DOC staff said that it would just be rejected so that he could still be transferred. He filed a grievance on this conduct. CUS said that if he writes another grievance, he will infract him.	The DOC staff member identified in this concern is no longer employed at DOC. The OCO does not have evidence to substantiate the retaliation claim. The OCO confirmed the individual has not been transferred from the facility.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
108.	Patient reports medication dosage for hormones was unexpectedly lowered without being informed first. Patient had consulted with regular provider about labs and provider had no concerns. Another provider then lowered the patient's dosages without any communication with the regular provider.	The OCO provided self-advocacy information related to RCW 43.06C which requires that the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve a concern through the grievance process, administrative actions, and/or an appellate process and after the grievance is at a level two response or if more than 90 days have passed since filing the grievance before the OCO may investigate the case.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
109.	The individual was transferred from the Intensive Management Unit to the Washington State Reformatory Unit. They have been put on suicide watch and are not allowed any calls.	DOC did not violate policy by moving the incarcerated individual. The OCO verified with DOC that the incarcerated individual was moved to the Close Observation Area and later to the infirmary for medical care. Phone calls are more restricted in these units, which is within DOC policy. The incarcerated individual is now housed in general population.	No Violation of Policy
110.	Patient has been asking repeatedly for the COVID booster, but the facility keeps delaying the administration of the shot.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO contacted DOC and confirmed the person received the requested resolution.	DOC Resolved
111.	The incarcerated individual reports	The OCO provided information. The	Information

	that they got a check from the IRS for \$3200, and DOC took \$1000. This happened to many people, and DOC was not supposed to take this money. The individual tried to grieve this issue but it was returned as non-grievable	OCO contacted the DOC about this concern. The DOC verified the deductions and why they were made. The OCO provided the person with a copy of their trust account statement as well as a copy of the deduction matrix from DOC 200.000. These documents helped explain the deductions and how they were calculated.	Provided
112.	The incarcerated individual is concerned they are not being given appropriate access to the incentive program including benefits like TV.	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
113. Twin Rivers Unit	Individual filed a PREA report about an officer who was doing some inappropriate things. The individual was told that this was substantiated and that more action would be coming. He has not heard anything from DOC regarding this and that CO is still working in his unit daily. He wants a final response from DOC and does not believe that they investigated this per DOC protocol.	The OCO's review determined that DOC has not substantiated this PREA concern and it is still under investigation. Once the investigation is complete, the OCO can review the finding.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
114.	Patient has been asking for an increased in medication dosage to align with treatment goals. Patient has reviewed lab results with provider, but the dosage levels have not changed.	The OCO provided assistance. This office alerted DOC and ensured that a previously canceled teleconference was rescheduled and that the individual's case was presented to the GD-CRC for review.	Assistance Provided
115.	The incarcerated individual was moved from their unit to the Intensive Management Unit and would like to go back to their previous unit. They are currently in restrictive housing and believe they should be housed in a unit with more privileges.	The OCO was able to substantiate this concern but was not able to achieve a resolution. The individual had multiple concerns that the OCO was able to confirm. However, this office wrote the person a letter informing them that housing decisions are made at DOC's discretion.	Substantiated Without Resolution
116.	The incarcerated individual is in the Intensive Management Unit and has not been given access to their kosher food.	The OCO was able to substantiate this concern but was not able to achieve a resolution. The OCO contacted the DOC about this concern. The DOC reported that a person cannot have commissary food items in the Intensive Management Unit unless they are level three. The OCO wrote a letter to the person confirming that	Substantiated Without Resolution

they are scheduled to receive a kosher diet from the facility, but that would not begin until after Passover.

117.	Individual reports staff conduct concerns. Staff have not adjusted the WaOne and now that he has a pending infraction, they are focusing on his WaOne before the infraction is even finalized. He asked why DOC would count the infraction before the infraction is finalized and he was told it would be edited if the infraction was dismissed. He feels he is on staff's radar after filing a lawsuit. He is afraid staff's actions are related and/or retaliatory.	The OCO could not substantiate a pending infraction that was negatively impacting the incarcerated individuals Washington ONE assessment. He was recently demoted during his custody facility plan; however, this was due to loss of points from infractions he received previously.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
118.	The incarcerated individual reports that they receive a channel guide every month which is time sensitive, and usually arrives a few days prior to the coming month. Recently, it has not arrived on time; on average it arrives a week late.	The OCO was able to substantiate the concern but was unable to achieve a resolution. The OCO determined that the TV guides are regularly delivered late, but that it is the fault of the publisher, not the Department of Corrections. This office wrote a letter to the individual explaining why the TV guides are late.	Substantiated Without Resolution
119.	Individual would like to transfer to Cedar Creek Camp in order to begin the transition back into the community. Individual is being sent to Crossroads which does not have programs to aid in transition back to the community.	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
120.	There is no heat in TRU at Monroe. Person spent all weekend shivering at night. He has been told they are working on it but nothing is happening.	DOC has resolved this concern. The incarcerated individual contacted OCO back to share the heat was fixed. In addition, OCO followed up with the superintendent regarding the heating problem to verify if it was fixed.	DOC Resolved
121.	The incarcerated individual reports that they are having issues with grievances and the grievance coordinators' responses. The person's grievances are sent back for re-write when they are simply trying to appeal the grievance coordinator's response as being informally resolved. The person is trying to resolve a food safety issue.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO contacted the DOC about this concern. The OCO determined that the grievance coordinator was within policy when they requested a re-write and the facility was working on a solution with the food carts.	DOC Resolved
122.	The incarcerated individual says that a staff member in their unit is	The incarcerated person has not pursued an internal resolution of this	Administrative Remedies Not

	discriminating against them because they are transgender and have friendships with other members of the LGBTQ+ community. The individual says that the staff member treats them differently. For instance, the staff person writes this person up for “behaviors” which are exhibited by everyone.	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.	Pursued
123. Twin Rivers Unit	Patient reports that he has been having serious gastrointestinal problems since 2018. After much back and forth with DOC medical, he received a diagnosis. DOC has given him medication to treat it but the issues persist. DOC has stated that he will go out to see a specialist, but these appointments have been rescheduled multiple times. He believes he is not receiving adequate care.	DOC staff resolved this prior to OCO taking action on the complaint. The OCO contacted DOC and confirmed an appointment has been scheduled to see a gastroenterologist.	DOC Resolved
124. Twin Rivers Unit	The incarcerated individual reports that the mailroom is not providing mail within the 72 hours as stated in policy. This person’s TV guide is delivered late every month and their incoming check is taking longer to process which is impacting their finances.	The OCO contacted the DOC about this concern. The DOC reported they are not behind, and TV guides are late due to the publisher. This office wrote this person a letter with this information.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
125.	There are new, thicker mattresses being stored on the unit and not being issued. Population is not being told how they can get a new mattress. They are receptive to the budget barriers but find it unacceptable that the mattresses that are available are not being issued.	OCO provided assistance by addressing this concern with the Superintendent. All of the available mattresses have been issued and MCC has ordered more. However, they are currently on back order.	Assistance Provided
126. Special Offender Unit	The individual requested that the OCO review and assess a use of force that occurred at Monroe.	The OCO reviewed the Use of Force packet and video. DOC was not in violation of the Use of Force Policy 410.200. DOC is authorized by policy to use force to regain or maintain control of an incarcerated individual in the event of harming themselves or others.	No Violation of Policy
127. Washington State Reformatory	Patient had been promised care following OCO investigation two years ago, but is having difficulty receiving care and treatment for pain management.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO contacted DOC and confirmed the patient is receiving pain management and has seen an outside specialist.	DOC Resolved

128.	The incarcerated individual reports that a staff member violated another person's confidentiality by showing multiple individuals that person's court case on their computer. The staff member also shows favoritism towards certain incarcerated individuals and gives those individuals access to their computer.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO determined that the staff person was within policy to view the hearing and there was no evidence that showed favoritism of other incarcerated individuals.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
129.	A loved one is asking for help with a visitation appeal believing to have been initially denied visitation in error.	The DOC verified the visitation denial and encouraged the loved one to appeal the decision with documentation. This office wrote a letter to the loved one and the incarcerated person with this information.	Information Provided
130.	Patient was scheduled for gender affirming surgery consult via telehealth but both appointments did not happen because of DOC staff tech issues. Patient's release date is approaching; concerned this has now delayed surgery beyond her ERD.	The OCO was able to substantiate this concern, but was not able to achieve a resolution. The offsite provider is no longer taking telehealth appointments. Confirmed appointment rescheduled; however, it is past the ERD.	Substantiated Without Resolution
131. Twin Rivers Unit	Family requested mental health and medical records and the DOC records department has not followed through with the request.	The OCO provided self-advocacy information to the complainant regarding steps for requesting someone's DOC mental health and medical records.	Information Provided
132.	The incarcerated individual reports that DOC is not following safety measures and protocol that keep them and others safe from the spread of COVID.	The OCO informed this person that this office has been actively monitoring DOC's response to COVID-19, including preventative actions. This office has been gathering COVID-related information from incarcerated individuals and will make additional recommendations to DOC for further improvements where needed and as appropriate.	Information Provided
133. Twin Rivers Unit	Person has a mental health disorder and has submitted kites asking to see mental health. DOC staff have not responded to them. The person went to their counselor, who has tried to help but mental health still has not responded.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
134.	Individual reports they sent a kite to their therapist asking for contact information for the police department. Staff responded with a phone number that does not work	The OCO provided information regarding the contact information for police department as originally requested.	Information Provided

on the prison phones. The individual wants to report a homicide and staff are telling him there is nothing they can do at this time.

135.	Incarcerated individual reports DOC denied their visitation application due to a domestic violence indicator. The indicator is on a conviction that is currently being appealed.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
136.	Doctor recommended joint replacement because of bone-on-bone contact and deformation. Patient states he has received no treatment for pain and is not scheduled for surgery. Patient says he was also denied gloves for impacts on palms from pushing his wheelchair.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO contacted the DOC and requested resolution for these concerns. As a result, DOC is treating the patient for pain and surgery is planned and will be scheduled when the patient meets the surgeon's clinical recommendations. DOC ordered the patient's gloves but there are supply chain problems causing delays.	Assistance Provided
137.	Person is requesting help for another incarcerated person with medical concerns. Incarcerated person needs a CPAP and help addressing hernia concerns, prostate issues, and cancer.	The OCO provided information to the incarcerated individual about an anonymous letter sent to the OCO about their health care. The OCO how to contact this office if they need assistance with health care.	Information Provided
138. Twin Rivers Unit	Incarcerated individual told staff that they needed to do something because there have been so many staff assaults and staff is not being disciplined. Then someone lied and said that he had threatened staff and he was placed in segregation. Then he received infractions.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. This office confirmed the individual had an infraction hearing. One infraction was dismissed and one was upheld. He was sent back to general population. He did not appeal the guilty finding of the infraction that was upheld. DOC policy permits an incarcerated individual to be housed in administrative segregation while an infraction is pending.	No Violation of Policy
139.	The incarcerated individual reports that DOC failed to follow guidelines when performing a COVID test on them. The person says that DOC's failure to follow protocol caused them to catch COVID again. Additionally, staff are not wearing proper PPE when coming from the quarantined units due to staffing shortages.	The OCO informed this person that this office has been actively monitoring DOC's response to COVID-19, including preventative actions. This office has been gathering COVID-related information from incarcerated individuals and will make additional recommendations to DOC for further improvements where needed and as appropriate.	Information Provided

140.	Incarcerated individual enrolled in college courses and has not received access to them yet.	The DOC staff resolved the complaint prior to any OCO action. The OCO learned that the application was found by DOC staff and the individual is enrolled and attending classes.	DOC Resolved
------	--	---	--------------

### Olympic Corrections Center

141.	The family member of an incarcerated individual reports concerns about the quality of the food available to the incarcerated population and wants to see change in what is available.	The OCO provided information regarding the OCO report published about food quality at DOC facilities, DOC literature on what foods are offered, and contacts to share their concerns with. The OCO also provided information about how to work with the legislature to advocate for changes to food served in DOC facilities as this is something that would be changed by legislation.	Information Provided
142.	Caller received a series of infractions regarding disobeying medical orders to use crutches while recovering from an injury. He has appealed and received a final guilty determination. The medical staff who was treating him for the injury saw him violating medical orders and issued the infraction. The individual disagreed, stating that his actions were within the medical instructions he was given. Later, the individual received a separate infraction for being out of bounds, of which he requested OCO review, stating that it was unfounded.	The OCO reviewed available disciplinary materials for both infractions. The out of bounds infraction was supported by ample evidence by DOC, and the individual did not offer any contradictory evidence that would overcome DOC's guilty finding. The medical infraction was supported by staff statements, and again, no evidence was offered to contradict those statements. DOC medical staff are in the best position to determine whether the individual's behavior was outside medical recommendations. On both infractions, the OCO did not find any apparent policy violations in DOC's disciplinary processes.	No Violation of Policy
143.	Patient's symptoms are not being addressed by medical.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The DOC transferred this person to a facility that could better accommodate his medical needs.	No Violation of Policy
144.	Individual is in segregation for a sexual assault. They received a summary of the confidential information related to it but still has not received an infraction. It has been 26 days and the person wants to be let out of segregation and/or receive a fair hearing.	Incarcerated individual requested their OCO case be withdrawn.	Person Declined OCO Involvement
145.	Incarcerated individual wants to challenge DOC policy that will not	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this	Administrative Remedies Not

	allow non-medically necessary DNA testing.	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.	Pursued
146.	Incarcerated individual is being transferred from camp due to medical concerns. The individual wants to stay at camp and has safety concerns at the facility DOC is transferring him to.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO finds DOC in compliance with DOC 610.110 Transfer of Individuals for Health Reasons and DOC 300.380 Classification and Custody Facility Plan Review under Attachment 1 Override Reasons/Decisions for Custody Assignments. The individual was transferred based on medical needs that could not be addressed at their current institution. The DOC moved him where he could get his medical needs met but also remain in a camp setting. The OCO contacted DOC headquarters about safety concerns with the move. The DOC spoke with the individual and confirmed that safety concerns were not present at the new facility.	No Violation of Policy
<b>Other</b>			
147.	Person was incarcerated for 14 days in jail and did not receive medical attention after the booking process.	The OCO's jurisdiction does not extend to jails.	Lacked Jurisdiction
148.	Individual reports that a Community Custody Officer (CCO) arrested him and returned him to prison because of a friendship he had developed. He reports he was trying to help the woman and he was not given any form of due process.	Community custody is outside of OCO jurisdiction; incarcerated individual was provided self-advocacy information related to DOC 320.110 Article V1 A. 1.	Lacked Jurisdiction
<b>Reynolds - King County</b>			
149.	Individual was returned to custody after an unauthorized leave from work release. He was told that personal property left at work release was donated or thrown away.	The OCO provided self-advocacy information regarding the forms and steps required to file a tort claim.	Information Provided
<b>Stafford Creek Corrections Center</b>			
150.	Family member of an incarcerated individual reports individuals who tested COVID-19 positive were moved into the same unit as COVID-	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. Moving individuals who are COVID-19 positive	No Violation of Policy

	19 negative individuals and they will share the same dayroom.	is within protocol set by DOC headquarters. DOC has made this tier the isolation unit for positive/symptomatic individuals who cannot be placed in alternate living areas due to medical concerns. The dayroom is not shared simultaneously. DOC is using protocols to sanitize the dayroom before each time it is used.	
151.	Loved one filed a complaint on behalf of her incarcerated relative about a dental issue. She reported that the medication given to him for pain was ineffective and that he needs immediate dental treatment.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on the complaint. The OCO confirmed that the dental issue had been successfully resolved.	DOC Resolved
152.	Incarcerated individual reports he was unable to transfer to camp because his COVID-19 test results were lost. The individual reported that other incarcerated individuals who had the same issue have transferred.	DOC staff resolved the complaint prior to any OCO action. The individual was transferred to the new facility.	DOC Resolved
153.	Incarcerated individual believes that the time served in jail and before incarceration within a DOC facility has not been properly calculated.	The incarcerated individual has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06.040(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
154.	Person stated he was scheduled for an appointment as a resolution from a previous OCO case but it was canceled twice.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO contacted DOC and was informed the patient's appointment had been rescheduled for the next weekday and a consult for further evaluation and treatment onsite was submitted the same day.	DOC Resolved
155.	The incarcerated individual's grievance has not been responded to and they submitted it over three weeks ago. They have now submitted a second grievance regarding this concern.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO determined that the grievance had an identification number and had received a response.	DOC Resolved
156.	The incarcerated individual requested single cell placement. DOC does not agree that single cell placement is necessary for the individual. The individual reports while in custody in another state he	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO found that DOC is in compliance with DOC 420.140 Cell/Room Assignment. The incarcerated individual was	No Violation of Policy

	was placed in a single cell.	screened for a single cell placement by DOC headquarters per policy 420.140(III); DOC did not find a need for the individual to have a single cell.	
157.	This individual is requesting that the facility provide an oatmeal-based shampoo or body wash.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. This office confirmed the patient has been referred to outside specialist already and is receiving treatment for this condition. The requested resolution is not within the DOC health plan formulary.	No Violation of Policy
158.	Person states that Health Services is unresponsive to his kites. He wants to know how to handle this.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO confirmed the appointments had been scheduled.	DOC Resolved
159.	The person got a letter from the IRS saying he needs to call them at an 800 number but he cannot call that number from inside the facility. They say staff are not being helpful with the forms.	The OCO provided self-advocacy information regarding access to the law library.	Information Provided
160.	This case was reopened by the OCO after patient reported that he was still not receiving physical therapy (PT) after previous OCO resolution with DOC. Patient reports he needs to learn how to walk again with specialized post-amputation physical therapy. He has undergone surgeries to remove fluid from his lung because he could not breathe and is still going through extensive therapy for this. Providers have recommended more movement and exercise. Patient followed up with the OCO and reported delayed access to medical appointment for other healthcare needs as well.	The OCO repeatedly contacted DOC medical to request resolution at the facility and headquarters levels for over a year. The OCO substantiated that COVID outbreaks caused scheduling delays for PT and medical appointment. The OCO also substantiated a history of the patient requesting the issue be addressed prior to the onset of the COVID pandemic. The patient was approved for DOC physical therapy sessions. DOC reports their in-house PT does not offer post-prosthetic specialized physical therapy for learning to walk. DOC ordered and installed additional PT equipment in the facility therapy room. DOC agreed to schedule patient for follow up to address overlapping medical concerns with new Facility Medical Director. DOC began providing available PT sessions again and the OCO was able to confirm continued sessions more recently (after updates about patient not receiving a full amount of sessions for recovery). Patient now scheduled with offsite physical therapy specialist for consult and treatment planning as well as a follow up with DOC PT	Assistance Provided

provider. Treatment plan will be updated at those appointments.

161.	Incarcerated individual is requesting a copy of his psychological evaluation needed for a hearing.	The OCO provided information regarding how to publicly disclose the psychological evaluation after it has been performed if DOC or the entity administering the evaluation does not provide it to them.	Information Provided
162.	Incarcerated individual was approved for release and housing in another county but DOC staff will not approve the plan.	DOC staff resolved the complaint prior to any OCO action. The OCO contacted DOC staff and learned that DOC wanted to exhaust the options in the incarcerated person's county of origin before approving the out of county plan. Once the home county options for release were exhausted, the out of county plan was approved.	DOC Resolved
163.	Person takes important medication every two weeks. Person reports he missed a shot. He states that this has happened before and he was assured it will not happen again.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO's contact to DOC revealed that Health Services had reviewed the appointment series and confirmed the next appointment is scheduled. DOC also stated they are making changes to patient navigation meant to address chronic care appointment tracking.	DOC Resolved
164.	The incarcerated individual reports that DOC is only processing some of the mail. This person has money on their books to cover the costs of the copies for outgoing mail.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. This office needed to review the response from the DOC regarding mail processing, but the incarcerated person withdrew their grievance.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
165.	The incarcerated individual is requesting OCO involvement with a public records request that was denied by DOC.	The OCO provided information regarding the person not getting their public disclosure request addressed correctly. This office wrote a letter with self-advocacy steps on how to address this issue further and provided additional information regarding organizational charts.	Information Provided
166.	The incarcerated individual is trying to get their Passover meal but is being told they need a release from medical because they are on a special diet. This person reports that they have been trying to contact the medical department.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO determined this person is being denied Passover meals because of a food allergy.	No Violation of Policy
167.	Individual reports DOC has been using COVID to cancel chapel for weeks. Although DOC has done a lot	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued

	to get other religions to services, incarcerated individuals who are Christian faith feel like they are not being treated fairly because they have not litigated for access. Prior to the first service they were supposed to have, DOC pulled the only staff member from the service and canceled the service rather than pulling from another area.	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.	
168.	The incarcerated individual reports that their visits are approved yet they have not had a video visit in months. The individual has contacted staff and JPay but has not received a response.	The OCO provided information regarding visits being canceled. The DOC reported canceled visits due to visitors using nicknames on their video visits. This office explained this information to the individual.	Information Provided
169.	The incarcerated individual reports problems breathing. They have requested to see medical, but medical says they will have to wait if it is not an emergency. The individual continues to have a tight chest and shortness of breath.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO determined that after the person submitted a grievance, the medical team set up allergy testing and the provider approved HSRs for this person. This office provided detailed information to this person via letter.	DOC Resolved
170.	Person reports that they were using one of two showers in the tier that have trans-appropriate stalls. One was being used so they went upstairs to use the available one. They received a Behavior Observation Entry for this.	The OCO provided information to the incarcerated individual regarding Resolution Program and other self-advocacy measures.	Information Provided
171.	The individual states that they were re-sentenced. They are under the impression that their old sentence should have been replaced with their new sentence; however, their current sentence does not reflect that.	Per RCW 43.06C.040(2)(e), the OCO lacks jurisdiction to investigate this complaint because the complaint relates to the person's underlying criminal conviction.	Lacked Jurisdiction
172.	The incarcerated individual requested for funds to be transferred to an outside account and they were denied that action. The individual had enough money to cover the cost. They tried to use the grievance procedure to fix the problem and were denied their resolution request.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy. DOC was following DOC 200.000 Contract and Outside Accounts. This office wrote this person a letter with this information.	No Violation of Policy
173.	Incarcerated individual states they were moved units and their cell door was left open resulting in their religious and sacred items box	DOC staff resolved the complaint prior to any OCO action. The OCO was informed by the incarcerated individual that their property was	DOC Resolved

	getting lost.	returned to them.	
174.	Person says that they have ongoing medical issues. When individual arrived at Stafford Creek Corrections Center, an outside provider told the individual that they are high risk for COVID. Person has not seen medical for 5 or 6 months.	DOC resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action. The OCO contacted medical staff and confirmed individual was recently seen by medical and has two pending appointments.	DOC Resolved
175.	A staff member called him a name and asked the Corrections Officer for a supervisor and the officer refused to get one. Wants the individual to be held accountable.	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
176.	Patient reports it has been over a year and he still hasn't seen a doctor. He has extreme nerve damage and his fingertips get numb and cold. Messaged medical several times and was never seen by a doctor. Confirmed nerve damage last year but has not received follow up.	The OCO confirmed the physician ordered wrist splints for patient's carpal tunnel syndrome and DOC had assigned a therapy aide for lifting laundry and carrying store purchases due to his shoulder issues. However the therapy aide was then withdrawn, prompting additional OCO follow up with DOC. The patient has now been approved for a therapy aide through ADA. DOC HQ will follow up with the ADA specialist.	Assistance Provided
177.	Patient reports he is sometimes unable to get to pill line before they close the window and hasn't been able to receive medication on multiple occasions.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO contacted DOC, confirmed the patient has the medications that are available on KOP. The Health Services Manager will be closely monitoring the pill lines in the future to see if changes need to be made to how long the pill lines are open.	DOC Resolved
178.	The incarcerated individual was moved back into the general population, but their other two infraction hearings have not happened yet.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO determined that hearings have been completed and the individual has been returned to general population. This office wrote this person a letter with this information.	DOC Resolved
179.	Incarcerated individual reports they were discriminated against because of their hearing impairment. DOC Staff gave him a negative Behavior Observation Entry (BOE) when the	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO requested that DOC change the BOE language, review relevant medical or ADA records confirming the individual to be hard of hearing,	Assistance Provided

individual did not hear DOC staff asking him to pull his mask up over his nose. There was a plastic barrier at the JPAY kiosk, and the DOC staff member was standing about 20 feet away from the individual in a loud dayroom. The staff member knows that he is hearing impaired. another incarcerated individual had to get his attention for him to hear the request.

and if verified to have the proper notifications given to DOC staff. DOC staff are in the process of reviewing the individual Health Status Reports (HSRs) and other documentation to ensure they have the proper accommodations to ensure staff are aware of his hard of hearing. DOC agreed to change the language in the BOE to make the BOE more accurate to the situation and not fault him for his hearing impairment.

180.	Person feels they should have access to the warmer, nonabsorbent gloves the therapy aides get. Person is willing to purchase them himself but is not given an opportunity to do so.	The OCO provided information regarding self-paid property ordering.	Information Provided
181.	Incarcerated individual reports the Correctional Program Manager (CPM) is ignoring the "48-hour rule" to appeal a Behavior Observation Entry (BOE).	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO requested a review of the BOE by the CPM and the CPM corrected the BOE for accuracy. The OCO does not find evidence in DOC 300.010 Behavior Observations that outlines any 48-hour timeframe for appeal so it is unclear where the mention of "48-hour rule" came about.	Assistance Provided
182.	The institution has not mandated vaccines for incarcerated individuals but has mandated them for staff. The person reports that prison is a confined environment and individuals cannot get away from each other. This person would like all incarcerated individuals to be vaccinated.	The OCO was able to substantiate this concern, but was not able to achieve a resolution. The DOC cannot force individuals to get vaccinated.	Substantiated Without Resolution
183.	Incarcerated individual reports they are being singled out for adverse treatment by medical because they filed resolution requests against medical. Examples of the adverse treatment include denial of a religious event and testing.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. For OCO to substantiate retaliation, there needs to be a protected action, followed by intentional adverse action, and the nexus between the two. OCO cannot substantiate retaliation with the information provided. The medical staff did make a mistake that kept this individual from attending a cultural event; although there is no evidence to prove this was intentional. This individual was asked to be tested again for Tuberculosis which, the facility currently has an outbreak of, and being tested multiple times is a common practice.	No Violation of Policy

184.	The incarcerated individual reports that DOC staff acted in bad faith and judgement, putting their life in danger by moving a COVID positive person into their cell before the results of the COVID test came back.	The OCO informed this person that this office has been actively monitoring DOC's response to COVID-19, including preventative actions. This office has been gathering COVID-related information from incarcerated individuals and will make additional recommendations to DOC for further improvements where needed and as appropriate.	Information Provided
185.	The incarcerated individual cannot visit with their children due to a harassment charge. They have extended family visits with other family members and don't understand why their children have not been approved.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. Policy 590.100 eliminates extended family visits with this person's children. This office wrote this person a letter with this information.	No Violation of Policy
186.	Incarcerated individual called asking for clarification regarding resolution process and OCO investigations. Incarcerated individual has had 13 pictures rejected by mailroom. They submitted a kite to the resolution coordinator for guidance on how to submit a grievance. Individual also reports filing a mental emergency today and received treatment/support from counselor for self-harm ideation.	OCO provided incarcerated individual information on utilizing Resolution Program and self-advocacy steps.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
187.	The incarcerated individual reports that they tried to resolve this concern via the Resolution Program, however, it has been more than fifty days and they have not received a response. They would like the facility to create a temporary employment plan for future outbreaks.	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
188.	Individual has been told that he cannot get a COVID vaccination booster.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 4.06C(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
189.	Person says that there are individuals in living unit who are on COVID quarantine and separated from the rest of the unit.-However, there are no separate bathrooms for those on quarantine. Bathrooms that	The incarcerated individual must pursue internal resolution per RCW 43C.06C.040(2)(b) before the OCO is able to investigate a case. This category applies if an individual did not file a grievance, appeal, or seek	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued

are shared are not cleaned or sanitized after use by those with COVID.

other administrative remedy prior to contacting the OCO.

**Washington Corrections Center**

190.	<p>Family member contacted the OCO with a concern about her incarcerated loved one's safety after the incarcerated individual was slated to transfer to a new facility. The- incarcerated individual requested other facilities for safety reasons, but those requests were denied. The incarcerated individual's family member requested that the transfer be halted due to safety concerns based on their sentence.</p>	<p>The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy. The OCO reviewed the individual's custody facility plan, as well as other records. The incarcerated individual has no prohibited placements, no security threat group concerns, and no individual separations on file. If the individual had specific concerns about threats, there is no record of the incarcerated individual utilizing the resolution process to raise those concerns to the DOC. The DOC appears to have followed DOC Policy 300.380 in assessing this individual for appropriate placement and assigning a facility accordingly. If the incarcerated individual receives threats or has other safety concerns, they may utilize the resolution program to ensure the DOC is made aware of those threats; this information was shared with the incarcerated individual and their family member.</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy</p>
191.	<p>Person reports receiving infractions for staff assault, which were dismissed. They have not filed a grievance because the officer it is about would receive it, and they fear retaliation.</p>	<p>The OCO provided self-advocacy information related to RCW 43.06C which requires that the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve a concern through the grievance process, administrative actions, and/or an appellate process or if more than 90 days have passed since filing the grievance before the OCO may investigate the case.</p>	<p>Administrative Remedies Not Pursued</p>
192.	<p>Individual was subject to a staff use of force while he was placed in close observation. The individual then received three infractions for threatening, assaulting, and injuring staff as a result of resisting restraints during the use of force. The individual asked that the infractions be reviewed; he felt that the incident report for the use of force contained multiple inaccuracies.</p>	<p>The OCO reviewed the incident report, staff statements in the disciplinary record, and the video of the use of force. No violation of policy was evident in the subsequent infractions; each infraction was supported by video evidence as well as staff statements, and the individual did not provide any additional evidence to contradict DOC's narrative. DOC was within policy to uphold the infraction. There was some question as to whether the individual's mental health was</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy</p>

properly considered as part of the disciplinary process. This issue was addressed in the OCO report on Mental Health Access and Services. DOC has committed to piloting program changes to address this issue more broadly.

193.	Incarcerated person communicated that Indeterminate Sentence Review Board (ISRB) staff members illegally used certain criteria in making a determination to revoke the incarcerated person's community custody. Incarcerated person says ISRB staff lied in support of each other and asked that the incarcerated person's decision be overturned and their community custody be reinstated.	The OCO lacks jurisdiction to investigate this complaint because the complaint relates to an action taken by an agency other than the Washington State Department of Corrections. The appropriate method to challenge an Indeterminate Sentence Review Board determination is to file a Personal Restraint Petition (PRP) in the Washington Court of Appeals. The PRP is a legal process, and the OCO is not in a position to assist with legal matters or offer legal advice.	Lacked Jurisdiction
194.	Person says that while in DOC transport the transport bus was involved in a vehicle accident. Person says they were injured in the accident and DOC is liable for their pain and suffering for failing to transport them safely.	OCO provided self-advocacy information related to RCW 43.06C which requires that the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve a concern through the grievance process, administrative actions, and/or an appellate process and after the grievance is at a level two response or if more than 90 days have passed since filing the grievance before the OCO may investigate the case.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
195.	When the individual was being transported to a new facility, the bus was in an accident. The individual was injured and has not received medical care or compensation.	The incarcerated individual must pursue internal resolution per RCW 43.06C.040(2)(b) before the OCO is able to investigate the case. The individual did not file a grievance, appeal, or seek other administrative remedies prior to contacting the OCO.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
196.	Person is 10 months past his ERD but is not getting responses from grievances or staff about what is going on. He said he was told he does not have an approved release plan or address. He said he went through that process while in work release and paperwork was already completed. He is not assigned a counselor at this time.	OCO provided assistance by contacting the facility to inquire about the release plan. After OCO contact, DOC met with the individual and submitted the release plan.	Assistance Provided
197.	Person reports that an officer with whom he has issues squeezed his arm very tightly and now he has pain	OCO provided self-advocacy information related to RCW 43.06C which requires that the incarcerated	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued

	in the upper area of his right arm. He filed a grievance for use of force. He wants to be moved to different facility.	person has reasonably attempted to resolve a concern through the grievance process, administrative actions, and/or an appellate process or if more than 90 days have passed since filing the grievance before the OCO may investigate the case. OCO could not find a grievance related to his issue or a use of force report. The incarcerated individual has since been transferred to a different facility which was part of his resolution request.	
198.	The incarcerated individual reports that the facility resolution coordinator does not comply with current policy. This person reports that all correspondence from the grievance coordinator to incarcerated individuals needs to be in a confidential envelope. The grievance coordinator is not doing that; instead, she staples the paper.	The DOC reported that correspondence from the resolution specialist is not required to be in an envelope. This office also contacted the DOC regarding this person's outstanding resolution requests. The OCO wrote a letter updating the person about resolution correspondence.	Information Provided
199.	Person reports that there is an officer who has been aggressive and hostile towards the Muslim community during Ramadan. He has thrown a Quran in the garbage and he hasn't handed out Ramadan snacks on two occasions even though its forbidden for Muslims to fast after the prescribed time. He removed the Ramadan microwave to a place where non- Ramadan participants can use it.	The OCO provided assistance. This office alerted DOC leadership of this concern. DOC agreed to investigate the incident.	Assistance Provided
200.	Incarcerated individual reports they are beyond their Earned Release Date (ERD) and their counselor will not finalize their release plans because they may be detained again due to an active warrant for arrest.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. Per DOC 350.200 Transition and release an authorized DOC employee will issue a department detainer for up to the Max Ex date per DOC 350.750 Warrants, Detainers, and Holds. The DOC staff have continued working on the individual's release, but nothing can be finalized because the DOC is only notified days before the release with information on if the individual will be picked up on the active warrant.	No Violation of Policy
201.	The incarcerated individual reports that the enhanced closed custody unit at the facility is a pod deemed a	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The DOC provided	DOC Resolved

	security threat. It is close custody and not restricted housing. Despite this, individuals are not given access to Jpay services, like video visits, e-mail, and media via wifi.	documentation to this office which indicates that they are actively working on this issue. This office wrote a letter to this person with this information.	
202.	Person says that their left arm was twisted by DOC staff while being pulled out of their cell. Person says they told staff to stop pulling and twisting because their left shoulder was hurt. Then the back of their neck was grabbed and they could not breathe. Person says this was over something they were accused of saying that they did not say and now they are being infraacted.	This concern was filed more than 30 days after the incident. The OCO typically cannot obtain video footage after 30 days. The OCO could not find an incident report stating this incident took place. The individual had a hearing for the infractions and he was found guilty. However, he did not appeal the infractions.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
203.	The incarcerated individual was concerned that they were still at the receiving facility and not transferred to the prison they were approved for.	DOC staff resolved the complaint prior to any OCO action. The OCO reviewed this person's placement and learned that DOC had transferred them to the approved facility.	DOC Resolved
204.	The incarcerated individual is past their max release date. and they are unclear why it was changed.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The DOC reported communication between the DOC and this person's loved one explaining their release date calculation. This office wrote a letter to the individual that stated the release date is correct and their release plan is in effect.	DOC Resolved
205.	Person says they have been taken off a medication due to policy, he believes he should qualify for the medication due to his diagnosis and release date.	The OCO provided information regarding next steps for patient to be placed back on the program at his new facility.	Information Provided
206.	Incarcerated person says that a urinalysis (UA) test performed on him came back positive for substance use. However, the incarcerated person told DOC staff in advance that he had just been transferred from county jail, where the incarcerated person was on a Medically Assisted Treatment (MAT) program for 13 months. The incarcerated person believed the program would have tainted his test result. Incarcerated person was nonetheless infraacted and found guilty. He wished to see the infraction reversed.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by the DOC. The OCO reviewed the available disciplinary record for this individual and requested that the DOC review the incarcerated person's appeal in light of claims that he was in a treatment program. DOC staff obtained a medical opinion stating that a substance from treatment would stay in an individual's system (identifiable by urinalysis) for 14 days. However, 28 days had elapsed between when the incarcerated person's treatment ended, and when he received the test. Therefore, the incarcerated person's infraction was	No Violation of Policy

upheld. DOC staff considered all relevant information in addressing his appeal and met their burden of proof for the infraction; no violation of disciplinary policy was found.

207.	<p>Person says that they are challenging Department of Correction's Medically Assisted Treatment policy. Person says they have a history of Opioid Use Disorder, history of Medically Assisted Treatment program prior to transferring to Washington Corrections Center. Person says DOC is not following Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) guidelines, providing people access to medication to treat addiction/disability. Person is afraid of overdose if prohibited from staying on medication.</p>	<p>Incarcerated individual was given information on self-advocacy via Resolution Program by OCO.</p>	<p>Administrative Remedies Not Pursued</p>
208.	<p>Incarcerated person recently had an erroneous infraction removed from his record, but his custody facility plan had not been updated (the previous plan included a custody demotion to reflect the infraction). The incarcerated person had grieved the issue, but not received a response. The incarcerated person was concerned that he would be demoted and transferred despite the infraction being removed.</p>	<p>The OCO provided assistance. The OCO alerted facility staff to the incarcerated person's concerns, and the incarcerated person's custody facility plan was promptly finalized. The incarcerated person has since been assigned a new custody level and transferred to an appropriate facility.</p>	<p>Assistance Provided</p>
209.	<p>Incarcerated individual disagrees with treatment before and after surgery, and that he was returned to his unit before he was clinically ready.</p>	<p>The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of his concerns. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b) the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.</p>	<p>Administrative Remedies Not Pursued</p>
210.	<p>The incarcerated individual reports they tested positive for COVID and were sent to a different unit, while others were sent to the gym. Those sent to the gym have an unrestricted phone with Wi-Fi, but those in the different units were denied Wi-Fi restoration. They also could not shower for five days or had time out to do so, and could only use the phone during the 20 minutes they were out.</p>	<p>The OCO informed this person that this office has been actively monitoring DOC's response to COVID-19, including preventative actions. This office has been gathering COVID-related information from incarcerated individuals and will make additional recommendations to DOC for further improvements where needed and as appropriate.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>

211.	Person says they are being treated unfairly. They have been asking for a new mattress because their current one is torn and causing physical, mental, and spiritual pain. Person asked staff and staff responded rudely to the request.	OCO provided self-advocacy information via Resolution Program to address delays in receiving a new mattress.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
212.	Individual reports DOC does not follow policy when drug testing at the facility. They do not have individuals washing their hands before they take a test, they do not check the expiration dates of the drug test. The staff is giving tests and strip searches with only one person in the bathroom with the individual. There should be another staff member that is outside the bathroom as testing and strip searches happen. Person was found guilty in his hearing. The individual has filed an appeal for not following the procedure. DOC is not providing the proper information for people to defend themselves with. Individual is still waiting for a response on their appeal.	OCO provided self-advocacy information related to RCW 43.06C which requires that the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve a concern through the grievance process, administrative actions, and/or an appellate process or if more than 90 days have passed since filing the grievance before the OCO may investigate the case.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
213.	Person filed a PREA report about a named staff member during a previous incarceration. Now he's back at WCC and the person he filed a PREA on was working in the unit he was placed in. When the staff member saw him, he was taken to restrictive housing the next day. While in restrictive housing he was getting showers and everything until the staff person's husband came on the unit, then he did not receive a shower for 11 days. He was also set to be transferred out but at the last minute it was stopped.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern. This individual was housed in Restrictive Housing while he was screened for safe harbor. He was not housed in the same living unit as the staff member he had filed the previous PREA about and her husband was not working in the Restrictive Housing Unit on the days in question. He has now been transferred to another facility.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
214.	The incarcerated individual reports that their Early Release Date (ERD) has been miscalculated. This person reports the prison is not giving them jail credit or good time credit due to an Indeterminate Sentence Review Board revoke and two new cause numbers.	The OCO provided information regarding this concern. The OCO determined this concern is outside of this office's jurisdiction. This office explained the next steps this person can take to appeal the Board's decision.	Information Provided
215.	The incarcerated individual is referencing multiple health services kites and three different facilities.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. This office sent a letter to	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate

The complaint is unclear at this time. the person requesting more information about the complaint, but the person did not respond back. This office has written a letter letting the person know we are closing the case because we have not heard back from them.

216.	Incarcerated individual would like medication for mental illness. He is having difficulty controlling psychosis from PTSD and severe anxiety disorder. Incarcerated individual is getting headaches, no sleep, sweating a lot, and has diarrhea. Incarcerated individual is having negative confrontations with others and cannot stop escalation.	Incarcerated individual left DOC custody upon OCO receiving the letter and creating the case for this matter.	Person Left DOC Custody Prior to OCO Action
------	--	---	---

**Washington Corrections Center for Women**

217.	This incarcerated individual has video visits with their daughter who is a minor. The daughter uses their mom's account who is their grandmother. The person received a 30-day suspension notice because their visitor was using someone else's account. Both grandma and daughter are approved visitors.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. Policy 450.300 was not violated by the suspension of the individual's family member. The OCO wrote a letter explaining the policy to this person.	No Violation of Policy
218.	Person states she was provided attorney contact information in lieu of an "inmate to inmate conference" to discuss a civil suit. It has been four months since she contacted that attorney and has not received a response.	The OCO provided incarcerated individual information regarding Resolution Program and self-advocacy steps.	Lacked Jurisdiction
219.	Patient called a medical emergency for neck and arm nerve pain and possible urinary tract infection. Individual reports DOC did a urinalysis, left her alone for 40 minutes, and told her there was not any medication they could give her. DOC then told her to sign up for sick call. Person felt dismissed entirely because she was not asking for medications; she wanted to be examined.	The OCO provided self-advocacy information related to RCW 43.06C which requires that the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve a concern through the grievance process, administrative actions, and/or an appellate process or if more than 90 days have passed since filing the grievance before the OCO may investigate the case.	Information Provided
220.	Person was falsely infracted and has had continuing issues with the officer.	The OCO provided self-advocacy information related to RCW 43.06C which requires that the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve a concern through the grievance process, administrative	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued

actions, and/or an appellate process or if more than 90 days have passed since filing the grievance before the OCO may investigate the case.

221.	<p>Family reports patient is being denied back surgery and was told DOC will not pay for it, she will have to wait until she gets out and pay for it herself. DOC dental pulled several teeth but will not cover dentures despite her inability to chew food. She was taken for a mammogram and was told she has to pay the fees and she does not understand why DOC is not covering the cost.</p>	<p>The OCO provided information regarding requesting specialized medical soft diets, how to follow up to report changes in symptoms, and next steps for back surgery reassessment. The OCO alerted DOC medical, Care Review Committee (CRC) found surgery level III not medically indicated in 2017 and recommended conservative therapies. More recent appointment shows improvement based on treatment plan of stretching, topical cream, and ice. The OCO confirmed patient is scheduled for upcoming dental appointment; substantiated delayed dental appointments due to COVID have now resumed. The office confirmed mammogram bill sent to DOC Headquarters Medical Pay for review and payment, copy sent to patient via kite. DOC reports patient not billed for procedure.</p>	<p>Information Provided</p>
222.	<p>Patient reports her legs have been swelling for the past year and says she was given compression socks and they did not help. She says she is in pain and has a hard time walking.</p>	<p>The OCO alerted DOC, confirmed diagnosis and treatment provided, which included compression stockings. Diuretics not medically indicated. DOC reports multiple no-show appointments, for edema and dietician, and patient not following compression stocking recommendations. The OCO provided patient with information on following up to reschedule missed appointments.</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy</p>
223.	<p>Patient reports a new person working the weekend medication line gave her the wrong medication. DOC staff handed over the medication and when the patient checked she told the person working that one of the pills was not hers. She gave the pill back, the nurse checked the pill, and it was not a medication prescribed to her.</p>	<p>DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The patient followed up with the OCO via hotline and shared that DOC talked with the nurse that provided the wrong medication and the issue has not occurred again as of that reporting date. Individual reports the medication tracking seems to be improved and nurse is paying more attention during pill line. Discussed following up if issue occurs again.</p>	<p>DOC Resolved</p>
224.	<p>There is a pilot program if you receive an infraction where mental</p>	<p>OCO provided self-advocacy information related to RCW 43.06C</p>	<p>Administrative Remedies Not</p>

	health helps you with your infraction. The person feels like there was not much effort into getting this person put in the program. They have not grieved this issue.	which requires that the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve a concern through the grievance process, administrative actions, and/or an appellate process or if more than 90 days have passed since filing the grievance before the OCO may investigate the case.	Pursued
225.	Person says that the new administration just took all her hijabs except one for policy compliance purposes. Person reports that she previously had been granted an exception to policy allowing her to keep more than one. Person says people are being targeted because they are Muslim.	Incarcerated individual received self-advocacy information regarding Resolution Program via hotline.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
226.	The patient reports in 2020 DOC providers said that liquid was coming into her lungs and that was why she was having pain. Her pain is located below shoulder blade but above waist. Soon she will be eligible for work release and is worried that she will not be able to work an 8-hour shift because of the pain. She does not want to rely on pills and wants to get to the root of the issue with this pain.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO alerted DOC medical and confirmed that the patient is receiving care under WA DOC Health Plan. DOC reports her chronic pain is associated with past hernia surgery. Medical contacted surgeon for follow up. Patient is scheduled with Facility Medical Director.	DOC Resolved

### Washington State Penitentiary

227.	Family and patient has not received follow up after concerning test results.	The OCO alerted DOC and followed up to share updated concerns reported by family. The office confirmed follow up appointments after OCO outreach. Patient has an active treatment plan that includes multiple keep on person (KOP) medications and an HSR for nonadherent dressings. DOC reports the patient has not picked up their KOP medications and encourages use of current treatment. Case has been submitted to dermatology specialist through RubiconMD and current treatment plan is recommended. Confirmed cardiology testing complete and normal results shared with patient. Patient disagrees with treatment; however, there is no violation of DOC Health Plan and a treatment plan has been prescribed. OCO attempted two calls with the	Assistance Provided
------	--	---	---------------------

patient but did not receive follow up. Patient also scheduled for two week follow up with DOC medical to discuss ongoing concerns.

228.	Loved one expressed concern about good time for credit served being incorrectly calculated.	The OCO sent the incarcerated individual a confidentiality waiver and after one month, did not receive it back. The case was closed with the inference that the incarcerated individual did not want to pursue the investigation.	Person Declined OCO Involvement
229.	Family member expressed concerns about an incarcerated individual's infractions: refusing to work (557) and (engaging in a work stoppage) 682, when the individual did not attend work due to COVID reasons.	When the OCO went to review the infraction, DOC had dismissed both infractions.	DOC Resolved
230.	Incarcerated individual reports he ordered 40 photos at \$0.50 each, totaling \$20 from a vendor on the incarcerated individual's JPAY player. DOC reviewed and rejected all the purchased photos. The incarcerated individual appealed DOC's decision to reject all 40 photos and DOC agreed to allow 11 of the 40 photos into the facility. Incarcerated individual wants the remaining 29 photos that DOC rejected.	The OCO reviewed the photos and agrees with the DOC decision to reject the 29 photos in compliance with DOC 450.100 Mail for Individuals in Prison. DOC does not monitor the content being sold by JPAY vendors and the photos are subject to inspection and rejection, per policy.	No Violation of Policy
231.	Incarcerated individual in the BAR units reports that it's inappropriate to mix people with mental health issues and those in protective custody. The individual reports that other incarcerated individuals make fun of him when he experiences mental health symptoms.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO spoke with DOC and confirmed that the incarcerated individual has access to report issues with other incarcerated individuals and frequent access to mental health services. The OCO recommended to the individual that he continue to address these issues as they arise with unit staff and his mental health provider.	Assistance Provided
232.	Incarcerated individual reports that DOC is not allowing him to publicly disclose his own medical records. He has a court injunction that prevents him from disclosing public records from DOC for five years; however, that injunction does not relate to medical records. He alleges that he is not able to view his records at the facility level, which, according to him, DOC agreed to do.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO confirmed DOC has a process for all individuals to access their medical records. The OCO has outlined this process to the person and provided tools to help with any barriers that may come up while using this process to obtain their medical records.	Assistance Provided
233.	The incarcerated individual placed a DOC Public Records Request that	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this	Administrative Remedies Not

	they paid .85 per copy. When they received the records, reportedly, they were ripped in half by a mailroom employee opening the mail. The individual is requesting that the mailroom replace the records request but their request has been denied.	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.	Pursued
234.	The incarcerated individual had their visits with family terminated last year. The DOC told the individual that once they can see evidence of positive behavior, they will consider creating a pathway for his wife's visits to be reinstated.	The OCO provided information regarding possible ways the incarcerated individual's family members might be able to have their visits reinstated.	Information Provided
235.	Incarcerated individual spoke to someone on the hotline about two weeks ago regarding being sent an ROI for his loved one to help with him receiving his property, but he had not received any mail from us.	The OCO sent a confidentiality form as requested.	Information Provided
236.	Incarcerated individuals in the BAR unit report that DOC staff are not providing enough rags for people to sanitize their cells. Incarcerated individual reports that there are only three rags total in their unit, and everyone must share.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. DOC staff confirmed to the OCO that incarcerated individuals now have access to appropriate cleaning supplies in the units where this incarcerated individual lives.	DOC Resolved
237.	Incarcerated individual states he received an introduction/transfer of drugs or drug paraphernalia (603) infraction when he overdosed and was caught with needles, not drugs. He believes that he should have received an infraction for possession, not introduction.	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of DOC policy. The OCO reviewed the infraction packet and hearing audio and found there was evidence to substantiate the transferring drug paraphernalia (603) infraction based on the fact that the needle was moved from the individual's cell to the garbage in the janitor's closet. This meets the elements required for this infraction per the DOC Serious Violation Guidelines. The OCO advised the individual that the finding of this infraction was within DOC policy.	No Violation of Policy
238.	Incarcerated individual reports that, by the time he received a response to his resolution request, it was past the time DOC policy allows to appeal the request. Incarcerated individual wants to be able to have meaningful access to the resolution program by being allowed to appeal this level one resolution request response.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO found that this resolution request was delayed because it was being reviewed by the Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) coordinator but did not meet the criteria for PREA. The OCO asked the resolution department to review again; DOC agreed to accept another resolution request about the concern and review	Assistance Provided

it outside of the policy driven time frame.

239.	A friend of an incarcerated individual reports that the incarcerated individual is not getting access to shower and shower supplies while his unit is on quarantine. The external friend also reports that staff are not complying with proper personal protective equipment (PPE) requirements, specifically the use of gloves and masks.	DOC staff responded to and resolved the concerns of the friend of the incarcerated person prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. DOC management will continue to ensure that DOC staff comply with proper personal protective equipment usage. DOC also confirmed that the incarcerated individual and all others have access to showers six days a week and adequate levels of hygiene supplies. Staff also explained to the population how to reorder when hygiene supplies run low.	DOC Resolved
240.	Incarcerated Individual is being held in the Intensive Management Unit (IMU) and has not been issued a TV. The incarcerated individual has requested a TV multiple times as he reports that he should be eligible to receive a TV based on his participation in programming.	The OCO substantiated that the incarcerated individual did qualify for a TV and that for two months, while he qualified for a TV, he was in a cell that did not have a working cable. At the time of this case closure, DOC staff report that they are still trying to resolve the cable issue in the original cell. However, after two months of eligibility for a TV, DOC moved the incarcerated individual to a different cell with a working cable.	Substantiated Without Resolution
241.	External family members of an incarcerated individual shared concerns about the mental health status of this incarcerated individual during the COVID-19 restricted movement. Family members report that isolation is extremely detrimental to this individual's mental health and state that he needs access to more time out of his cell. The incarcerated individual was later placed in administrative segregation for refusing to COVID-19 test, which may cause further harm to the individual's mental health.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. Incarcerated individual was sent to administrative segregation for his own safety after refusing a COVID-19 test. The refusal would have restarted the unit's quarantine time, which could have endangered this individual. The incarcerated individual was held and released from administrative segregation in compliance with policy 320.200 Administrative Segregation.	No Violation of Policy
242.	External friend of an incarcerated individual reports that an incarcerated individual was unjustly taken to the Intensive Management Unit (IMU) after a staff member made reports of not being comfortable around him. External friend says that it is unjust to move him just because DOC staffed the unit he lives in with a staff member	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO discussed the incident with facility leadership while the incarcerated individual was housed in administrative segregation prior to a disciplinary hearing. Subsequently, he was found not guilty of all infractions related to the incident and was later transferred to a different facility.	Assistance Provided

who has issues with him.

243.	Person states he is experiencing concerning physical and mental health symptoms and is having trouble accessing care.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO contacted DOC and informed them of the patient's needs, as a result he was seen by staff during rounds and scheduled for requested appointments.	Assistance Provided
244.	Individual reports having an issue with his counselor. She will not help him get his programming points back.	OCO provided incarcerated individual information regarding Resolution Program and self-advocacy steps.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
245.	Incarcerated individuals JPAY tablets are locking up because they cannot sync them to the JPAY kiosk during COVID quarantine and isolation.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO recommended that DOC staff should sync/unlock the JPAY players at the request of the incarcerated individuals so that they remain usable. DOC agreed to have staff sync/unlock the JPAY players during the COVID-19 restrictive movement.	Assistance Provided
246.	Person reports back injuries from a fall. Patient was taken to a local hospital and sent back with pain medications which medical at the facility denied him access to along with other medical treatment. Person is now using a wheelchair and is having difficulty accessing the shower because of the injury and lack of medical care. Patient was refused an MRI.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO alerted DOC medical, DOC reports initial CT scan did not show fractures. MRI was pending review due to metal in patient's back, no record of being denied. Patient later received MRI that confirmed mild fractures. Patient was scheduled for follow up with the Facility Medical Director (FMD), discussed recent results, and prescribed short term pain medication after OCO outreach. Patient previously did not qualify for pain medication due to negative CT results. Confirmed wheelchair accessible ramp to showers now complete and functional. DOC also offered lower bunk HSR, denied by patient.	Assistance Provided
247.	Patient reports that he received an ultrasound several months ago but follow ups have been canceled multiple times. After finally seeing the doctor, his medications were changed to address possible iron deficiency resulting in pain and other symptoms. He later went to the doctor and was informed that DOC medical had not checked his lab results until recently. Results showed spleen is enlarged and indicate that he needs to see a specialist.	The OCO alerted DOC medical and confirmed lab work was done and the patient was scheduled for follow up for GI and/or Hematology to discuss RubiconMD consult results, care plan, and additional testing. The specialist appointment will be discussed and scheduled at follow up if it is determined to be medically recommended via RubiconMD feedback. The FMD instructed the provider to also focus on patient's pain and consider potential neuropathy workup or medications if indicated at next appointment.	Assistance Provided

248.	<p>The incarcerated individual reports that Washington State Penitentiary (WSP) has implemented a new policy that allows DOC to dispose of incarcerated individual's food while they are in the Intensive Management Unit (IMU). Also reports that he was placed into IMU last year and DOC took away programming points. He does not know why DOC took away points when DOC placed him in IMU.</p>	<p>The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO's review determined that DOC is following DOC 320.200 Administrative Segregation. Incarcerated individuals can be placed in administrative segregation for refusing housing, which is what occurred in this situation. The OCO confirmed that WSP does have an operational memorandum stating that perishable food items will not be stored in long term storage. The OCO was not able to substantiate that any programming points were withheld. The OCO recommended that he file a resolution request to ask about his programming points.</p>	No Violation of Policy
249.	<p>Incarcerated individual reports discrimination from DOC staff. The incarcerated individual believes he was wrongfully terminated from his job based on discrimination of alleged gang/security threat group (STG) affiliation. The incarcerated individual denies this STG affiliation.</p>	<p>The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO found that the incarcerated individual was reassigned to another job duty after DOC staff observed that he and other incarcerated employees had not completed their assigned job duties.</p>	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
250.	<p>Incarcerated individual was informed that DOC will soon be reviewing his facility placement and custody points per regular DOC classification protocol. DOC wants to transfer the individual to camp but he reports he needs to stay in protective custody. He would like to stay where he is currently housed in protective custody.</p>	<p>DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO reviewed the custody facility plan and found that DOC finalized the individual's placement to remain unchanged. He will not transfer to a different facility or to a camp at this time.</p>	DOC Resolved
251.	<p>Incarcerated individual reports that DOC is moving COVID-19 positive and negative incarcerated individuals around without cleaning the cells they are placed into beforehand. Additionally, he reports that incarcerated individuals in the BAR units do not have access to the law library and he wants DOC to formally address this via a memo.</p>	<p>DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO confirmed that DOC has provided the incarcerated population with information about how to receive legal access at this facility during the COVID-19 restricted movement. DOC explained that incarcerated individuals are provided this information in the form of "cell stuffers." Cell stuffers are documents containing pertinent updated information about the facility. Further, DOC staff report that movements for quarantine and isolation are following COVID-19</p>	DOC Resolved

protocols.

252.	Incarcerated individual reports that his unit has been on quarantine for 30 days and someone just recently tested positive which will restart their quarantine. The incarcerated individual wants the quarantine protocols to change so they do not have to quarantine for this long.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The DOC implemented policies to address COVID-19 conditions within the facilities. The OCO was not able to determine the DOC actions in this case were outside of the DOC policies.	No Violation of Policy
253.	Incarcerated individual reports that he has had a loss of property totaling around \$2,000 and is experiencing retaliation from staff.	The OCO reviewed all evidence sent by the complainant and reviewed related DOC records. Based on the OCO review, the OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate the complaint.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
254.	Incarcerated individual is being held in Washington State Penitentiary Intensive Management Unit (WSP IMU) pending transfer to another facility. He has requested to speak with his classification counselor about removing some old keep separate orders with other incarcerated individuals as these orders are creating a barrier for him to be placed at a different facility closer to his family support.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. This individual's counselor has investigated removal of the separate orders but found that the orders remain active for valid reasons. DOC's decision to not removed the keep separate orders follows DOC 320.180 Separation and Facility Prohibition Management.	No Violation of Policy
255.	The incarcerated individual reports that for the last eight weeks, the food manager has not provided salt, pepper, or margarine packets on the food trays.	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
256.	Incarcerated individual was infractioned with multiple minor infractions. These minor infractions caused him to lose his job and receive a major infraction. He does not believe that it is fair he lost his job and states that he wants it back.	This person was released prior to the OCO taking action on the complaint.	Person Left DOC Custody Prior to OCO Action
257.	Incarcerated individual was infractioned for not wearing his mask and was told he was going to be fired from his job but he has not yet been found guilty of the infraction. He has been completing programming and feels the job is being stripped from him.	The incarcerated individual did not appeal the infraction despite a previous letter from the OCO about self-advocacy strategies to appeal the infraction. RCW 43.06C requires the individual appeal the infraction before the OCO can investigate. Because the individual did not do this, the OCO was unable to complete an	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued

investigation.

258.	Person is being told by medical that custody is responsible for providing additional or new mattresses but custody is saying that medical is responsible for approving the double mattress and other tools. Patient also reports he has not seen a provider.	The OCO was able to substantiate this concern but was not able to achieve a resolution. The OCO communicated with Facility Medical Director and patient was subsequently seen by provider. Also communicated with ADA Coordinator following their meeting with the patient. Patient does not qualify for a mattress under medical or ADA policy. Mattress issuing decisions are made at unit level.	Substantiated Without Resolution
259.	Person says that another person in their unit started a fight and they both yelled at each other. This led to him being the only one punished for yelling. During lockdown for the incident, staff refused to help him with a kite, took away his lunch, and wrote that he was misbehaving in an infraction report. Later, the same person, a confidential informant, falsely made accusations about him making threats against the staff member for infracting him.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
260.	Incarcerated individual was given a serious infraction for a violation of the mask mandate (717). He feels that this infraction is racially motivated and feels that it is nonsense for staff to infract adults for not wearing masks in the dining hall. He received another infraction for the same thing a few days prior, and he believes the hearings officer should have looked at both infractions. He states that the hearings officer is committing double jeopardy by holding onto the infractions until the other ones are heard. He states that the corrections officer told him that they just pick and choose people to randomly infract in the dining hall and when staff get in trouble, they then get the incarcerated people in trouble.	The OCO reviewed the infraction packet and hearing audio and found there is evidence to substantiate the infraction as this is the second time that the individual was not wearing his mask as required which satisfies the elements for a 717 infraction for causing a threat of injury to another person by resisting orders. Per DOC Policy 460.000(IV)(D), the hearing for each infraction will be held within five business days of service of DOC 05-093 Disciplinary Hearing Notice/appearance Waiver and DOC 17-076 Initial Serious Infraction Report. Because the individual received separate infractions on separate dates, they each had their own separate hearing that was in accordance with DOC Policy 460.000(IV)(D).	No Violation of Policy
261.	The incarcerated individual ordered American Indian religious items from a magazine listed as an approved vendor at their facility and the order was denied by the property sergeant.	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	No Violation of Policy

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

---

262.	Incarcerated individual says that he was infractioned for inciting a demonstration in the day room but says he was only talking to a couple of people. The individual states that later an officer threw his JPAY tablet against a wall in the holding cell.	The OCO reviewed the infraction packet and the available video of the incident. The video showed an officer setting the tablet down on a tub, in which the tablet slid off and hit the ground. The video does not show the officer throwing the tablet against a wall. Due to the video not including audio, the OCO was unable to substantiate the demonstration infraction concern.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
263.	Incarcerated individual states that their counselor filed major infractions against them out of retaliation when he filed a PREA complaint and grievance against said counselor.	The OCO was unable to find sufficient evidence to substantiate the individual's concerns. The OCO reviewed the individual's grievances and infraction packet. The latest grievance to the infraction date was ten months prior. Because there was not a grievance directly before the infraction date, there does not appear to be enough evidence to substantiate that this infraction was related to retaliation. The infraction narrative had evidence to substantiate the infractions as the individual yelled at staff in an intimidating manner and refused to leave from the counselor's office. This action substantiates the 663 infraction for intimidation and the 509 infraction for refusing to disperse based on testimony from two separate staff members who partook in the incident. The PREA report was not received by DOC until the day after the infraction was issued. The OCO informed the incarcerated individual that there was insufficient evidence to substantiate their claim.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
264.	Incarcerated individual states that he received an infraction for not wearing a mask while eating and this is impacting his custody.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO reviewed the infraction and noted that the individual had received the same infraction a week earlier and it had been reduced. They then engaged in the same behavior a week later and the infraction was upheld despite an appeal. Per a memo issued last year by DOC leadership, the	No Violation of Policy

---

hearing officers will reduce serious infractions for lesser infractions when applicable. DOC followed this policy when the first infraction was reduced. It was not a violation of policy when DOC did not lower the second infraction as it was the same behavior that was the subject of the first infraction.

---

265.	Incarcerated individual heard that other incarcerated individuals were talking about his charge. He alleges DOC staff shared his charge with other incarcerated individuals. The sharing of his charge put him in danger, and he was assaulted and sent to another facility because of the assault. Once at the other facility he continued to receive harassment by correctional officers and incarcerated individuals at the new facility. He believes that this is because DOC staff statewide were sharing details about his charges.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO reviewed all material related to the complaint and was not able to identify evidence that proves that staff gave other incarcerated people access to his charges. DOC responded to this person's assault appropriately by removing him from the unit and facility where he was targeted.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
------	---	---	---------------------------------------

## 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