

Notice: The Office of the Corrections Ombuds is currently updating our case closure process to ensure that our data reflects the outcomes reached by the office and to provide greater transparency into the work of the office. We anticipate implementing these changes with the March 2022 Monthly Outcome Report.

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). Per RCW 43.06C.040(2)(k), at the conclusion of an investigation of a complaint, the ombuds must render a public decision on the merits of each complaint.

As of September 1, 2020, all cases open at the time and all cases opened since by OCO are considered investigations for the purposes of the statute. The following pages serve as the public decision required by RCW 43.06C.040(2)(k).

In providing an anonymous summary of each complaint, OCO staff have worked to limit as much identifying information as possible while still providing a substantive explanation of the concern so as to protect the complainant's confidentiality while also providing transparency into the office's work.

All published monthly reports are available on the OCO website at oco.wa.gov/reports-publications/reports/monthly-outcome-reports.

Closure Reason	Explanation
Assistance Provided	OCO was able to achieve full or partial resolution of the person's complaint.
Information Provided	OCO provided self-advocacy information.
DOC Resolved	DOC staff resolved the concern prior to OCO action.
Substantiated Without Resolution	The OCO verified complainant's concern, but we were unable to achieve a resolution to the concern.
Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate	There was insufficient evidence to verify the complainant's concern.
No Violation of Policy	After reviewing all relevant documents and DOC policy, OCO staff determined that DOC policy was not violated.
Lacked Jurisdiction	Complaint did not meet OCO's jurisdictional requirements (typically when complaint is not about an incarcerated individual/not about a DOC action).
Administrative Remedies Not Pursued	The incarcerated individual must pursue internal resolution per RCW 43.06C.040(2)(b) before the OCO is able to investigate the case.
Person Declined OCO Involvement	Applies when person did not want the OCO to pursue concern when the OCO received no response to requests for more information.
Person Left DOC Custody	Applies when person left DOC custody prior to OCO action.
Unexpected Fatality Review	Person has died unexpectedly, and the death is under review.
Duplicate Case	Person already has a case in the OCO CMS regarding the same concern.

Monthly Outcome Report

February 2022

Institution of Incident	Complaint/Concern	Outcome Summary	Case Closure Reason
Airway Heights Corrections Center			
1.	Incarcerated individual submitted an emergency grievance requesting his test results and was told that it was not an emergency. He was placed in the special management unit (SMU) because staff were unwilling to provide him with his test results or speak with him about this. Now he is on a waiting list to be approved to be released from SMU by the facility medical staff. He would like to be taken out of SMU. Individual alleges that procedures and policies are not being followed; DOC staff are using COVID to do whatever they want.	The OCO provided assistance. After OCO staff contacted facility leadership, the DOC transferred this person out of segregation.	Assistance Provided
2.	Incarcerated person reports multiple issues: access to law library, a lost bracelet, and delays in responses from the Resolution Program.	The OCO was able to substantiate the loss of the bracelet and provided information about the tort claim process. OCO staff contacted DOC staff regarding this person's access to the law library. The DOC indicated that the person does have access when the facility does not have restricted movement. The OCO provided information about requesting priority access to get more time in the law library. OCO staff substantiated the delays with resolution requests at the facility and statewide. OCO notified facility staff of this concern.	Information Provided
3.	Incarcerated individual states that he submitted his infraction appeal at the end of December and has still not received a notification on the outcome.	The OCO alerted facility leadership of the concern about the pending appeal. DOC leadership reported that due to the COVID-19 outbreak at the facility, infraction appeals have been delayed and are being worked on.	Assistance Provided
4.	Incarcerated individual was found guilty of a 603 infraction for drug introduction but was never tested for drug use. The individual believes that DOC policy states that one cannot be found guilty of this infraction if they do not receive a drug test.	The OCO reached out to the facility regarding the delay in infraction appeal response. DOC entered the appeal in a timely manner after the OCO elevated the concern. The 603 (introduction of drug paraphernalia) was reduced to a 752	Assistance Provided

(possession of drug paraphernalia) as the evidence did not substantiate the originally issued infraction.

5.	Incarcerated individual states he is back in prison due to an indeterminate sentencing review board (ISRB) revocation for 18 months. He states his hearing was canceled and there is no formal notification or further information about this revoke. He states he is not receiving responses from kites and his counselors and other DOC staff members are refusing to talk to him.	The OCO reached out to the facility and obtained the date in which the individual will have a hearing. The individual was advised of this date.	Assistance Provided
6.	Incarcerated individual received an infraction and lost their tier job. After losing that job, the individual was asked to do it for the rest of the month and into the next month. The individual did not receive their earned time for part of the time they had worked.	The OCO reviewed the infraction packet and grievances the individual provided. Based on the information in the infraction packet, there is sufficient evidence to substantiate the infraction. OCO's review found that the person had not grieved their concern about not earning time for working their job. This office informed the individual that this issue must be grieved and reach a level two response before OCO is able to investigate.	Information Provided
7.	Incarcerated individual reports that DOC staff wrote two separate infractions (a WAC 505 for fighting and 661 for engaging in sexual harassment towards staff) that contained false information. They state that the officer fabricated the fight causing the 505 infraction. He states that he was not talking about the female staff in medical but was talking about someone on the TV. He reports that DOC fabricated the witness statement of his wheelchair pusher.	The OCO reviewed the infraction packet for both infraction concerns. Based on a staff member's witness statement and four evidence photos, there is sufficient evidence to substantiate the 505 infraction. Based on a staff member's statement, there is sufficient evidence to substantiate the 661 infraction. The OCO's review could not substantiate allegations that the statements involved lying or fabrication.	No Violation of Policy
8.	Incarcerated person requested information about reentry and any resource material that would be useful for their upcoming release.	The OCO provided contact information for two reentry service organizations. The OCO also explained how to get his ID and Social Security card prior to release by working with his counselor.	Information Provided
9.	Incarcerated individual reports that incarcerated people are not getting enough time out of their cells to sync their JPAY players which will lock up their devices. The individual also reports that mental health is not available at all currently. He has declared multiple mental health emergencies and had no response. He also reports other	The OCO informed this person that this office is not opening investigations for individual cases in relation to DOC policies 410.030, 410.430, 410.050, 670.000 and RCW 43.06.220 in its handling of COVID-19 concerns. However, OCO has been actively monitoring DOC's response to COVID-19, including preventative actions. This office has been gathering COVID-	Information Provided

	incarcerated individuals are controlling who accesses the cordless phone DOC provides to individuals in COVID-19 isolation. The individual reports a lack of response from the resolution department.	related information from incarcerated individuals and will make additional recommendations to DOC for further improvements where needed and as appropriate.	
10.	Incarcerated individual reports that staff are holding racial bias's while working in the temporary living unit in the gym. The individual reports he was infracted for using his keyboard too loud while other white incarcerated individuals did not get reprimand for the volume of their keyboard.	The OCO informed this person that this office is not opening investigations for individual cases in relation to DOC policies 410.030, 410.430, 410.050, 670.000 and RCW 43.06.220 in its handling of COVID-19 concerns. However, OCO 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. The OCO explained that infractions must be appealed prior to OCO investigating them.	Information Provided
11.	Incarcerated individual reports he has been held in isolation for 21 days due to continuing to test negative for COVID-19. Individual reports that other incarcerated individuals that have recently recovered from COVID-19 have access to day room, yard access and are allowed to go to their jobs. The individual also reports DOC serving them cold and frozen food.	The OCO informed this person that this office is not opening investigations for individual cases in relation to DOC policies 410.030, 410.430, 410.050, 670.000 and RCW 43.06.220 in its handling of COVID-19 concerns. However, OCO 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
12.	Incarcerated individual reports that all incarcerated individuals in his unit are required to use the same showers. The individual is concerned that other incarcerated individuals that have recently recovered from COVID-19 are still possibly contagious, and DOC is not cleaning the shower stalls regularly. The Individual also reports that his unit does not have access to cleaning supplies for in-cell use. He reports that incarcerated individuals are completely isolated unless they have recently recovered from COVID-19. He does not know who on his unit is still actively positive and is worried about possible COVID-19 exposure and the method DOC has implemented to mitigate spread.	The OCO informed this person that this office is not opening investigations for individual cases in relation to DOC policies 410.030, 410.430, 410.050, 670.000 and RCW 43.06.220 in its handling of COVID-19 concerns. However, OCO 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

Cedar Creek Corrections Center

13.	The incarcerated individual was demoted from one facility to another after an investigation for an escape that he did not participate in and was never infraacted for.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO contacted the DOC about this concern. This office must wait for the DOC to finish their investigation before reviewing the information. The OCO wrote a letter to this person with this information.	Unable to Substantiate
14.	The incarcerated individual is having an issue with their classification level. They would like to be screened for minimum security classification status after a deceptive pre-assessment that was done by their counselor.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO contacted the DOC about this concern. The DOC reported that a new custody facility plan was made which included a recommendation for a gate pass and track one graduated re-entry planning. This office wrote this person a letter with this information.	DOC Resolved
15.	The incarcerated individual was sent from one facility to another because of an investigation. Incarcerated individual mentioned that he asked staff at this facility if he could speak to someone in internal investigations. He reports his request was never granted.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. This office wrote their loved one a letter advising them to contact the OCO once the initial investigation has been completed.	No Violation of Policy.
16.	Incarcerated individual says that their counselor will not screen them for graduated re-entry track two. They applied for the voucher but were told that their counselor must file for it, and she will not do it because she will not screen him.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO reviewed this person's records and determined that the individual does not meet the criteria for track two graduate reentry. This office informed the person that they may apply for track one within one year of their earned release date.	No Violation of Policy
17.	The incarcerated person shared concerns regarding the methods DOC uses to reduce exposure to COVID 19. The individual offered suggestions for improvements regarding facility capacity and transfers.	The OCO informed this person that this office is not opening investigations for individual cases in relation to DOC policies 410.030, 410.430, 410.050, 670.000, and RCW 43.06.220 in its handling of COVID-19 concerns. However, OCO 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. The OCO also provided information regarding the Space Use Standards	Information Provided

Policy-250.440 and the Facility Capacity Policy- 400.020 for their review.

Clallam Bay Corrections Center

18.	The incarcerated individual reported that staff are allowing the incarcerated population to turn the air purifiers which were placed in the unit to help with air flow because of COVID on and off frequently. This does not allow the purifiers to work properly.	The OCO informed complainant that this office is not opening investigations for individual cases in relation to DOC Policies 410.430, 410.050, 670.000 and RCW 43.06.220 in its handling of COVID-19 concerns. However, the OCO has been actively monitoring DOC's response to COVID-19, including preventative action. 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
19.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about a tort claim. He says his TV was shipped from AHCC to CBCC and worked just fine but when it arrived it did not work and was damaged. He says his tort claim was denied and wants assistance with this.	The OCO reviewed documentation related to this concern and found that DOC would not give the individual the damaged TV as that is considered contraband. The OCO is unable to assist with the tort process but advised the incarcerated individual that they can attempt to file another tort claim or contact DES to discuss the concern further.	Lacked Jurisdiction
20.	The incarcerated individual was involved in a physical altercation and was subsequently transferred to another facility. During the transfer, his property was lost so he filed a tort claim. He was not reimbursed for his loss and feels that he is being racially discriminated against.	The OCO is unable to assist with locating lost property or the tort process and advised the incarcerated individual that they can attempt to file another tort claim or contact Department of Enterprise Services to further pursue their claim.	Information Provided
21.	Incarcerated individual states that a contract attorney was trying to mislead him by stating that they would provide him assistance. He was given the run around and, in the end, did not receive any help from attorney.	The OCO does not have jurisdiction to investigate concerns related to non-DOC action and were unable to further review this complaint. The OCO did provide this person a copy of the SB 6164 and SB 6164 Final Bill Reports to help them find the information they are seeking.	Information Provided

22.	A family member of an incarcerated person shared concerns regarding the physical safety of her loved one and reported that DOC has denied him access to a safe housing assignment.	The DOC staff resolved the complaint prior to any OCO action. The OCO learned that DOC staff resolved this by reviewing the request for a safe placement and considering the person's classification. It was decided by DOC that the person would transfer out of the facility. The DOC found that placement into protective custody would restrict this individual more than the transfer to another facility.	DOC Resolved
23.	A family member of an incarcerated person reports their loved one's property has not been received since they transferred out of the Intensive Management Unit.	The OCO provided self-advocacy information to the incarcerated person to help them go about resolving the concern shared. This information included step-by-step guidance on filing resolution requests to find the property and the tort claim process for reimbursement if the items are confirmed as lost.	Information Provided
24.	Patient reports staff are not following their long-term health status reports (previously approved by the Care Review Committee) in the IMU.	DOC resolved the concern before OCO involvement. Patient was moved out of IMU.	DOC Resolved
25.	The incarcerated person shared concerns regarding not receiving the privileges given to those housed in the Intensive Management Unit (IMU), for example, he did not receive a radio after 30 days of living in the IMU. The person also shared concerns about not receiving resolution request responses.	The DOC staff resolved the complaint prior to any OCO action. The OCO learned that the DOC gave this person a radio, more commissary access, and processed his resolution request.	DOC Resolved
Coyote Ridge Corrections Center			
26.	Incarcerated individual reports that there was extra food and instead of passing it out to incarcerated individuals, the counselor threw it away saying that the population did not deserve any extra trays.	The OCO informed the individual that they must grieve this concern and receive at least a level two response before OCO is able to investigate per RCW 43.06C(2)(b) as the individual must attempt to resolve it through DOC internal grievance process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
27.	Incarcerated individual states that CRCC does not stamp and date incoming mail and that DOC continues to violate the policy that establishes a timeframe for periodical delivery.	The OCO informed the individual that they must grieve this concern and receive at least a level two response before OCO is able to investigate per RCW 43.06C(2)(b) as the individual must attempt to resolve it through DOC internal grievance process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
28.	Person reports that other incarcerated individuals were telling people what they can and cannot do or they would be assaulted, mostly because of their charges. He informed staff about this and was told that they already knew who	The OCO could not substantiate a violation of policy. The OCO contacted DOC staff regarding this issue as well as the grievances. The DOC reported the incarcerated individual did not want to cooperate with DOC's grievance investigation. As a	No Violation of Policy

these individuals were. He then grieved this but his level two grievance response was unresolved because he did not provide names of other incarcerated individuals. However, he reports that he did not do this because staff told him they already knew who these people were.

result, the DOC was unable to substantiate the stated concerns. DOC did not violate any policy in this investigation as the individual was unwilling to provide names of people he was concerned would attack him.

29.	Incarcerated individual reports DOC rejected mail stating that it included information from another incarcerated individual. He is seeking approval from the superintendent, but DOC is not giving him an answer. He reports there is no policy that provides a timeline for the superintendent to respond to this request for accessing the documents. He states he is in a current court case with the bar association because an attorney needed to refund money to him and his mother. He reports that the bar association will not send the documents again because they know that it will be rejected again.	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
30.	Incarcerated individual says that he completed intensive management status (IMS) in July however, DOC wrongly deducted five days of his earned time for July. When he arrived at another facility, he states staff took an additional five days earned time for August. He says he was off IMS awaiting transport after that, not for disciplinary reasons.	The OCO contacted DOC headquarters staff to get a better understanding of the time deductions. The incarcerated individual was in the program for the entire month of July, and as a result, was not eligible for those five days to be returned to him. However, the individual left the program before the 20-day minimum requirement in August and DOC gave him back the five days for that month after the OCO brought this concern to their attention.	Assistance Provided
31.	Incarcerated individual states that he has a grievance chain about not being able to participate in his religious expression as he needs fire to perform rituals.	The OCO investigated the grievances related to this concern. Based on the response DOC provided, it appears that DOC resolved the concern by stating religious activities would reopen once COVID conditions improved. The individual was informed that if he was unsatisfied with this outcome, he could have appealed the level two grievance response to headquarters, raising it a level three grievance. Alternatively, he was informed that, if this continues to be a concern, he could file a new grievance.	DOC Resolved
32.	Incarcerated individual expressed concerns about a 752 infraction for possession of drugs. He states he was infractioned for his cellmate's contraband. The individual states that he thought it was policy that the cell needed to	The OCO investigated the infraction packet and other related materials. Because the intoxicating substance was found in the common area of the cell, regardless of if the cellmate claimed	No Violation of Policy

be searched before someone moves in, and he had been in the cell for less than 48 hours when the infraction happened.

possession, the incarcerated individual would also be infringed through the cell-tag policy. This is not a violation of DOC policy.

33.	Incarcerated individual reports that he must stand outside in freezing temperatures to access his medications.	The OCO contacted facility staff to get a better understanding of this situation. The staff took the concerns about the pill line process that occur during normal times right before the facility went to COVID outbreak status directly to facility leadership. They asked if heaters or awnings could be installed or if diabetics could be allowed out earlier to queue inside the health services building rather than outside. DOC is still in discussion about these topics, and the individual was advised that the concerns have been raised to facility leadership.	DOC Resolved
34.	Incarcerated individual reports that he has used the grievance process but did not get any results. He says DOC staff mistook him for the wrong person and almost subjected him to a life-threatening illness. He feels that DOC continues to sweep his concerns under the rug.	The OCO reviewed the grievances and informed the individual that they can file a tort claim for the compensation they are requesting.	Information Provided
35.	Family member reports that an incarcerated individual is being transferred to a facility where the victim of his crime is housed. They state DOC is aware of this and they are still transferring him anyway.	The OCO spoke with DOC staff about the pending transfer concerns. This concern was taken into consideration during his review and the concern was appropriately addressed so that the individual and the victim will be kept in separate areas.	No Violation of Policy
36.	Patient reports that he needs dental care. He was called in once but told he needed to get tested for COVID first.	DOC resolved this concern prior to OCO involvement. The patient is receiving dental care.	DOC Resolved

Monroe Correctional Complex

37.	Intensive Management Unit	Loved one of incarcerated individual contacted the OCO because the individual is being housed in the intensive management unit. The incarcerated individual has no access to amenities or healthcare provider. He has serious health issues.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. This office reviewed the incarcerated individual's location and verified that they have been moved out of the intensive management unit. The OCO wrote an email to their loved on with an update about this incarcerated individual.	DOC Resolved
38.	Intensive Management Unit	The incarcerated individual reports that they had to stay in the hospital for a few weeks. While they were away DOC staff packed their cell. When the individual returned, they notice some of their property was missing and a pack out matrix had not been completed. DOC staff state they do not know what happened to the individual's property and	The OCO is unable to assist with locating lost property and provided information to the complainant on filing a tort claim with the Department of Enterprise Services to further pursue their claim.	Information Provided

that because they were moving fast, things may not have been done properly.

39.		The incarcerated individual is being transferred to another facility in order to support housing concerns. Individual does not want to be transferred and has filed a formal appeal.	The OCO was able to substantiate this concern but was not able to achieve a resolution. This office reviewed this person's information and at this time there was no pending transfer. This person is to remain at this facility. The OCO wrote this person a letter with this information.	Substantiated Without Resolution
40.	Twin Rivers Unit	Incarcerated patient is concerned the medications ordered for him are potentially harmful for his chronic health conditions.	The OCO provided assistance. This office confirmed that the outside specialist consult had been approved. The OCO verified that DOC staff sent the request to the scheduler for next steps. Also, an appointment was scheduled with the provider to discuss treatment in the interim. This office wrote this person a letter with this information.	Assistance Provided
41.		Patient states he is not being properly evaluated for chronic pain. He has exhausted the grievance and appeals process. Patient states he has not received the physical therapy appointment that was offered. Requested MRI and further testing to determine treatment options and to begin approved physical therapy.	Confirmed physical therapy appointment approved/scheduled. Alerted facility health services of this person's concerns. The DOC agreed to submit the case to orthopedics and the Care Review Committee (CRC) for updated review. Provided CRC information and an appeal form via mail.	Assistance Provided
42.	Twin Rivers Unit	Person reports that several of the prisoners who work in the inmate kitchen were put on quarantine for having contact with a staff member who tested positive. Most prisoners were moved to the Intensive Management Unit to quarantine, however those who had a single man cell remained in their unit. Those who remained in the unit were allowed to go back to work and handle food. Now the facility is on facility-wide outbreak status.	The OCO was unable to determine the complaint involved a DOC action upon which an OCO investigation could be based. The DOC implemented policies to address COVID-19 conditions within the facilities. The OCO was not able to determine the DOC actions in this case were outside of the DOC policies such that an investigation could be initiated.	Information Provided
43.		Person reports that the kitchen in this facility is not fulfilling their medical diet.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO contacted the DOC and the DOC reported they have issued HSRs for supplemental diet request.	Assistance Provided
44.	Special Offender Unit	Person received two EIP checks and DOC subjected them to full DOC deductions.	The DOC is following current state and federal protocols for CARES Act deductions therefore OCO is unable to refund money deducted. The OCO provided person with information about the CARES Act deductions.	Information Provided
45.		Person started new medication about four months ago. Person should be receiving increasing doses but reports	The OCO provided assistance. Following contact by the OCO, the DOC responded to this office indicating that staff had	Assistance Provided

not getting them appropriately. Filed medical emergency because nurse refused to give correct dosage.

increased the dose and that the person's labs would be checked every three months with an additional annual physical.

46.	Intensive Management Unit	The incarcerated individual was in the transfer pod that was full of non-active security threat group members when DOC put in an active member and that individual attacked him. This person wanted the policy violation looked into because he knows non-active and active security threat group members should not be mixed.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO contacted the DOC about this concern. The DOC was unaware of the incarcerated individual's status. Since this incident DOC has updated their records and the complainant did not receive an infraction. This office wrote this person a letter with this information.	DOC Resolved
47.		A loved one contacted the OCO about an incarcerated individual in need of dental work. A tooth needed to be extracted or a root canal procedure performed in order to address an infection deep in the nerve.	DOC staff resolved this this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The individual was contacted by the OCO and confirmed that the dental issue had been resolved.	DOC Resolved
48.	Washington State Reformatory	A loved one contacted the OCO about an incarcerated individual who has been in quarantine for over thirty days.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO reviewed this person's housing location and verified that the incarcerated individual has been moved out of isolation and returned to their regular housing unit.	DOC Resolved
49.	Washington State Reformatory Unit	The incarcerated individual needs their medical supplies. They have kited medical and have not received a response or any more supplies.	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
50.	Twin Rivers Unit	Incarcerated individual was moved from one part of the prison to another and has had no property for more than 21 days. He is borrowing other people's clothes and hygiene products.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO contacted the DOC about this concern. The DOC reported that the individual was moved back to their unit and was given all their property back the next day.	DOC Resolved
51.		A loved one contacted the OCO on the behalf of their fiancé who was supposed to have already gone to work release but did not go because he was quarantined for five days. It has now been three weeks and he is still on quarantine even though he has tested negative for COVID.	The OCO provided information to their loved one regarding the fact that the incarcerated individual will not go to work release until the facility is off outbreak status. This office wrote this person a letter including this information.	Information Provided
52.	Twin Rivers Unit	Person says that DOC disciplinary hearing staff scheduled his infraction hearing earlier than initially indicated, violating his right to 24 hours of notice. Person says that staff told him he would be getting an override, so he had	Individual did not appeal the infraction, because they initially pled guilty. OCO cannot review an infraction unless all appropriate administrative remedies have been pursued. Even if custody staff believed an override is pending, ultimately the	Lacked Jurisdiction

already signed the waiver and pled guilty. Person says that DOC staff are using this tactic to open beds.

individual's guilt is determined by the hearing officer. Custody overrides involve multiple staff determinations and, at times, a long waiting period. If the individual felt he was intentionally misled by staff into pleading guilty, he has a right to utilize the Resolution Program to grieve staff misconduct.

53.	Intensive Management Unit	Individual is being held in segregation long term while awaiting a housing placement decision by the DOC. This person was placed in segregation originally "for their safety" and they have been there ever since. This person also reports that staff are also not respecting their legal name change.	The OCO provided assistance. Following contact by this office, DOC staff moved this individual from segregation, and the housing protocol was sent to headquarters.	Assistance Provided
54.		The incarcerated individual reports that when they had no toilet paper and requested some, DOC staff did not provide any.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. This office determined that more than 30 days have elapsed since the incident and video footage is no longer available. The OCO could not substantiate whether this incident occurred. This office wrote this person a letter explaining this information.	Unable to Substantiate
55.	Special Offender Unit	Person's loved one contacted the OCO about their son. They said that he wrote two kites about having no access to power while he is in segregation. He has a court-imposed deadline and needs his device charged to send and receive information, as well as needing all his legal paperwork.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. Upon OCO contact, the DOC reported the individual will be moved out of the close observation area (COA) and property will be returned to him as soon as staff receive clearance from mental health staff. This office sent an email to their loved one with an update on this process.	DOC Resolved
56.	Twin Rivers Unit	Person says that are experiencing problems connecting to friends and family with Verizon phones ever since the 5G rollout.	The OCO does not have authority to investigate or assist with complaints relating to non-DOC actions including third party vendors.	Lacked Jurisdiction
57.		Incarcerated individual received an infraction for not being able to provide a sample for a UA. Incarcerated individual was asked to do the UA the morning of his release date, which goes against policy 420.380. Policy states that individuals being released from a level two facility to partial confinement will be tested at least 24 hours prior to release. Incarcerated individual's infraction resulted in the delay of his release, which means he is no longer eligible for graduated reentry.	The OCO reviewed the disciplinary information. Individual brought up the policy violation during his hearing and on appeal, and both times DOC responded with incorrect interpretations of DOC Policy 420.380. DOC also cited a recent memo which altered some of the UA policy for COVID protections, but DOC confirmed after OCO outreach that the memo is not a blanket revocation of all UA policies during COVID. DOC administration was unwilling to overturn the infraction despite the policy violation, because the individual	Substantiated Without Resolution

ultimately still refused a sample, which suffices for the infraction.

58.	Twin Rivers Unit	Family member was concerned that her loved one received an infraction for lighting a fire after not being allowed to review confidential investigation materials. Family member felt the infraction elements for the 553 were not met by DOC, and that restitution as a sanction was not appropriate. Further, her loved one was held in administrative segregation for two months while an investigation was completed for the subsequent infraction.	The OCO reviewed the full disciplinary record, including confidential information. With the confidential information, DOC had sufficient evidence to uphold the infraction. The loved one admitted to doing one of the actions listed by DOC as an example of behavior worthy of a 553 infraction. According to WAC 137-28-400, failure to follow timelines for disciplinary investigations is not grounds for dismissal. The OCO understands that this often leads to extended periods in administrative segregation, a topic previously reviewed by this office. Finally, restitution is an applicable sanction for any serious infraction regardless of the elements of that infraction, subject to the discretion of the hearing officer. The restitution sanction was within the sanction table attached to DOC Policy 460.050.	No Violation of Policy
59.	Washington State Reformatory Unit	Caller reports they were infraacted for strong-arming/intimidation after an incident with a staff member. While he was in the day room, an officer approached and called for him to cell in. He hurried to cell in, but in order to get to his cell, he had to approach the officer on the walkway. When he did so, the officer believed he was moving in an aggressive manner and told him to stop. The officer wrote an infraction, stating he felt threatened. Caller provided multiple witness statements saying he was not being aggressive or intimidating.	The OCO reviewed the video and other disciplinary information and notified DOC to request additional consideration. The DOC was not willing to overturn the infraction. Ultimately, intimidation is based on the subjective fear of the infracting officer at the time of the incident. The OCO was unable to identify a violation of DOC 460.000 on the part of DOC.	No Violation of Policy
60.	Twin Rivers Unit	Incarcerated individual feels like they are racially targeted. Incarcerated individual received a 663 infraction and went to IMU. When they compare their situation to that of others, they think that they are being discriminated against.	OCO reviewed video of the incident, as well as all other disciplinary materials. Due to the low evidence standard, per DOC 460.000 and 460.050 (Disciplinary Processes and Sanctions), DOC did not violate policy in upholding the infraction against the individual. OCO is not empowered to compare custody scores or classification levels with other individuals who have not requested assistance. However, race equity is an ongoing concern for OCO, and will continue to work with DOC to address systemic concerns of racism within facilities.	No Violation of Policy

61.	Washington State Reformatory	Incarcerated individual reports a lack of access to reentry services. Also reports concerns regarding staff behavior and DOC's response to the COVID-19 outbreaks.	The OCO informed this person that this office is not opening investigations for individual cases in relation to DOC policies 410.030, 410.430, 410.050, 670.000, and RCW 43.06.220 in its handling of COVID-19 concerns. However, OCO 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. The OCO did open a separate case to review reentry concerns.	Information Provided
62.	Twin Rivers Unit	The incarcerated person shared concerns regarding the DOC's COVID 19 mitigation efforts and the lack of communication from the DOC and requested OCO visit the facility to investigate.	The OCO was able to provide assistance by visiting this facility the next day. The OCO made recommendations to DOC at the facility to address multiple COVID-19 response related concerns; these were resolved onsite. .	Assistance Provided
63.	Intensive Management Unit	Patient states he needs to be seen by an eye specialist rather than the DOC provider. Disagrees with the DOC ophthalmology treatment received.	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
64.	Intensive Management Unit	The patient is under quarantine in segregation housing and has not received post-surgery treatments.	The OCO provided assistance. The patient returned to the home facility. The OCO escalated the medical portion to the facility medical director (FMD) and health services manager (HSM). As a result, the DOC agreed to follow up with the patient. The OCO then confirmed medical is following post-surgical recommendations and a follow up appointment has been scheduled.	Assistance Provided
65.	Washington State Reformatory	Patient reports he was misdiagnosed and the wrong medication was ordered. He suffered side effects as a result. Patient also reports negative treatment by staff on multiple occasions. He has requested treatment for gastrointestinal problems.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO contacted the DOC about this concern; as a result the patient transferred facilities and staff conduct was reported to health services leadership.	Assistance Provided
66.	Twin Rivers Unit	Patient reports insufficient pain management is being provided while surgery is delayed by COVID.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. Patient was able to speak with dentist and resolve the pain management issue. Follow up appointment was in scheduling queue at time of contact.	DOC Resolved

67.	Special Offender Unit	Person filed an emergency grievance but does not have the log ID number and never received a response. The concern relates to a staff person accusing him of having a dirty cell which he alleges was clean. Additionally, during a cell search staff took down his religious picture.	Per RCW 43.06C, the OCO cannot investigate a complaint unless the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it via the grievance process, administrative actions, and/or an appellate process (level one for medical, mental health, PREA and use of force concerns, level two for everything else).	Information Provided
68.	Special Offender Unit	Person submitted a complaint about a behavior observation entry (BOE) and two separate grievances that he wrote about the underlying incident. Person states that staff members were lying in the BOE.	Per RCW 43.06C, the OCO cannot investigate a complaint unless the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it via the grievance process, administrative actions, and/or an appellate process. The OCO informed person that he is free to continue grievance process and then contact this office when grievance reaches a level two. The OCO also suggested appealing the BOE.	Information Provided
69.	Intensive Management Unit	This incarcerated individual was sent to the intensive management unit for COVID isolation. They have received ten COVID tests but were not given the results of their tests. Since arriving in the intensive management unit 14 days ago, they still have not received clothing. This person filed an emergency grievance and mental health has responded, but they still have not received undergarments.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO checked the status of this person's housing unit and determined they were no longer in the intensive management unit. The incarcerated individual has gone back to their regular unit and has access to all of their clothing items.	DOC Resolved
70.		The incarcerated individual says that staff lied to him to keep him confined at this facility for an extra four months.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO contacted the DOC about this concern. The DOC reported the person is currently in a residential treatment unit, and that their mental health team will decide when they are ready for transfer to a different facility.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
71.	Twin Rivers Unit	The patient used emergency call button in their cell six to seven times over a 10-minute period with no staff response.	The OCO provided information regarding the resolution request that has been uplifted to a level two concern with a due date that has been extended.	Information Provided
72.		Incarcerated person reports that staff yell at incarcerated individuals for not being six feet apart. They do not allow cards, chess, or any type of socializing. Yet the staff continually stand in close groups, sometime with mask down. Administration refused to discipline rank and rank refuses to discipline all other staff.	The OCO informed this person that this office is not opening investigations for individual cases in relation to DOC policies 410.030, 410.430, 410.050, 670.000, and RCW 43.06.220 in its handling of COVID-19 concerns. However, OCO 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	Information Provided

make additional recommendations to DOC for further improvements where needed and as appropriate

73.	Twin Rivers Unit	Incarcerated individual states that a custody unit supervisor (CUS) opens and reads incarcerated individuals' correspondence. CUS says they do it to check for contraband, but this CUS will stop and read the correspondence.	The OCO informed this individual that the DOC staff member in this complaint has been reassigned to an alternative position.	Information Provided
74.	Intensive Management Unit	This individual has been waiting a year for eyeglasses.	The OCO provided assistance by contacting staff at another facility who located the glasses and delivered them to the individual at IMU.	Assistance Provided
75.	Twin Rivers Unit	Person expressed that there is one staff member in the unit who has a very toxic leadership style. The staff member yells at all of the inmates in the unit, calls them names and takes an aggressive physical stance. With that staff member's leadership style, other staff have adopted the same behaviors. The unit can no longer take this type of abuse from staff.	The OCO was unable to find a relevant grievance on file. Informed person that they must first file a grievance as a means of pursuing internal resolution as required by RCW 43.06C under most circumstances.	Information Provided
76.	Intensive Management Unit	The incarcerated individual reported to his family that he has not had a shower for days. He also reported that he had not exercised and was on lockdown. Staff are denying him access to mail his letter to the OCO.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
77.	Washington State Reformatory	A family member of an incarcerated person shared concerns regarding their loved one being placed in more restrictive housing, although they did not test positive for COVID-19.	The OCO provided information regarding the reason for the movement to the incarcerated person and informed the complainant that this office is not opening investigations for individual cases in relation to DOC policies 410.030, 410.430, 410.050, 670.000, and RCW 43.06.220 in its handling of COVID-19 concerns. However, OCO 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

Olympic Corrections Center

78.		Person says they have an immigration detainer placed on them and they are seeking assistance. They want to be	The OCO does not have independent authority to release persons on EHM or jurisdiction to review immigration cases.	Lacked Jurisdiction
-----	--	---	--	---------------------

	released on Electronic Home Monitoring (EHM).	Provided person with contact information for Northwest Immigration Rights Project.	
79.	Person states that facility is a reentry center that offers no reentry assistance to the population.	Informed individual that the OCO will not be opening an individual case for this general concern but that the issue may be considered for future review.	Information Provided
OTHER			
80.	Incarcerated individual reviewed infraction history and noted that he was not in Washington DOC custody when he allegedly received an infraction.	The OCO reviewed the infraction and supporting materials. The person received the infraction in 2019 while in a federal facility. The infraction is duplicated locally as a WAC infraction to maintain a consistent record of the individual's period of confinement, but appeal processes are still governed by federal Bureau of Prisons (BOP), which has authority over the underlying infraction. The OCO does not have jurisdiction to review an infraction that is subject to the federal/BOP appeal process.	Lacked Jurisdiction
81.	Family member of an incarcerated individual housed at a jail contacted the OCO to report being harmed by the jail staff at a visit to the facility.	The OCO lacks jurisdiction to investigate this complaint because the complaint relates to an action taken by an agency other than the Washington State Department of Corrections.	Lacked Jurisdiction
82.	Family member of an incarcerated individual in a jail reports the staff are coming to work ill without getting tested for COVID-19. This is spreading COVID-19 throughout the jail.	The OCO lacks jurisdiction to investigate this complaint because the complaint relates to an action taken by an agency other than the Washington State Department of Corrections.	Lacked Jurisdiction
83.	Incarcerated individual believes they were wrongfully arrested. Incarcerated individual does not believe they match the suspect that was identified during trial. During trial the witness stated they suspect had long hair, but the incarcerated individual says they had short hair during that time.	The OCO cannot investigate complaints involving non-DOC actions, <i>e.g.</i> , court actions, including sentencing and crime of conviction; actions by another state agency; complaints against third party vendors; or issues related to a city or county jail.	Lacked Jurisdiction
84.	Person says that they experienced a medical emergency that occurred while in custody at the Lewis County Jail.	Incident happened while in the custody of Lewis County Jail thus the OCO does not have jurisdiction to review the complaint.	Lacked Jurisdiction
85.	Incarcerated individual believes they have been wrongfully incarcerated.	The OCO does not have the authority to investigate an underlying criminal conviction or order an individual's release from custody. This office provided person contact information for the Innocence Project Northwest.	Information Provided

86.	Incarcerated individual requested that the Attorney General pardon a past conviction and is upset that they have not followed through.	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
Stafford Creek Corrections Center			
87.	Patient disagrees with treatment for painful rash and wants to see a specialist. Patient also has asthma and says he was supposed to receive a breathing test but it has been over four months and he hasn't received it yet. He reports his blood pressure, inhaler, and other medications were abruptly discontinued a few weeks ago.	Confirmed additional treatment options updated and prescribed for rash, including antibiotic and ointment. Patient scheduled for follow up appointment with provider and can discuss if a specialist consult is needed at that time. Confirmed inhaler prescription also filled and records indicate some delayed refill requests, however, indicate recent refills. Medical may consider switching from keep-on-person (KOP) prescription status to pill line for medication access, monitoring, and refills. DOC did not provide information about a breathing test.	No Violation of Policy
88.	Person says that staff are not enforcing social distancing or mask wearing and they are allowing four to a table, not following cohorting, and incarcerated people are working out in the bathroom not caring about spreading COVID.	COVID related concern. The OCO entered concern into the OCO COVID Tracker and sent letter explaining next steps. The OCO relayed their concern to DOC anonymously.	Information Provided
89.	Person says that his pod has not gotten any outside exercise because of being on quarantine. The food is poor quality and is brought to the unit lukewarm to cold and is barely edible. About 100 out of 120 are ready to go on food strike.	COVID related concern. The OCO entered concern into the OCO COVID Tracker and sent letter explaining next steps. The OCO relayed their concern to DOC anonymously.	Information Provided
90.	Person says that COVID-related procedures and protocols are not being followed regarding social distancing. Staff is not taking any disciplinary actions.	COVID related concern. The OCO entered concern into the OCO COVID Tracker and sent letter explaining next steps. The OCO relayed their concern to DOC anonymously.	Information Provided
91.	Patient was diagnosed with multiple sclerosis and expressed trouble accessing medical following appointment with outside neurologist. He said he was prescribed a cane, medication and has not received follow up. He said he has not been scheduled with his neurologist and his pain medication as reduced and less effective. Says DOC is not following specialist recommendations.	The OCO's review noted that the DOC has been trying to confirm an appointment for a pain specialist and they have scheduled an appointment with neurology in the upcoming months.	DOC Resolved
92.	Patient expressed concerns with current medical conditions that cause pain. He says he may need further	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. Physical therapy consults have been entered	DOC Resolved

	testing, specifically an MRI.	as treatment plan. Appointment will be scheduled when available.	
93.	Patient is requesting an MRI and treatment for neurological symptoms.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. MRI was completed by time of outreach.	DOC Resolved
94.	Person reports that they were determined not releasable by the Indeterminate Sentence Review Board (ISRB).	The OCO informed person that ISRB decisions can be appealed by filing a Personal Restraint Petition (PRP) to the Court of Appeals. The OCO informed him that he may wish to consider seeking legal counsel to assist with filing the PRP.	Lacked Jurisdiction
95.	Person says that their time calculations and community custody terms in their J&S were applied incorrectly.	The OCO provided person with self-advocacy options to write to records and pursue grievance higher-level grievance response.	Lacked Jurisdiction
96.	Incarcerated individual had COVID-19 and had long lasting effects afterwards and was still seeking medical treatment. Incarcerated individual received an infraction for refusing to program after telling the program director that he still felt sick and was afraid of being further exposed to COVID, so he could not be in class. Additionally, incarcerated individual believed that DOC was incorrect about his sentence requiring the program.	The OCO requested additional DOC review. The DOC responded that, although the program was not required by the individual's sentence, it was required by DOC after their initial assessment of the individual. The DOC has the authority to mandate programming and treatment. No HSR was provided by the individual, either to the program staff or during the hearing, showing the individual's medical staff precluded him from participating. The DOC declined to overturn the individual's infraction.	No Violation of Policy
97.	Individual received a 607 infraction for being unable to provide a sample for a drug test but stated that the inability was due to medication. No health status report (HSR) was given for the effects of that medication, despite the individual's attempts to contact medical to be assessed for one. Now, the individual is facing a three-year loss of extended family visits (EFVs) due to mandatory sanctions. The individual asked that the infraction be dropped, because it was due to a medical issue outside his control.	OCO reviewed the full disciplinary record as well as related medical information. DOC 420.380 requires an HSR for medical extension of UA time and does not provide for any other medical exemption. The OCO cannot supersede a medical determination on an individual's eligibility for an HSR. DOC acted within policy in upholding the infraction when no HSR existed. However, OCO does agree that the current three-year loss of EFVs for a refusal to test is excessive; DOC reports that they will be modifying that mandatory sanction down to a one-year loss.	No Violation of Policy
98.	Person reports that he was assaulted by medical staff when he refused to go to an appointment. Person was hit when a staff member opened the door so hard it that it fractured his knee and sent him flying across the floor hitting his head (required stiches/ now in wheelchair due to incident). They are holding up the investigation and not responding	The OCO reviewed the incident reports and grievance investigation. This office substantiated that the person had been hit by the door. However, the OCO could not identify evidence to substantiate intent on the part of the medical staff; all witnesses stated it was accidental. Person's grievance	Substantiated Without Resolution

	after multiple grievances. They stated they needed more time to investigate that was months ago.	response was delayed and recently changes were made to medical staff at the facility to address these issues.	
99.	Incarcerated individual reports that the conditions at the facility during the COVID-19 outbreak is not adequate. Individual reports people are being housed in the gym, lack of access to proper masks, and a lack of access to cleaning supplies.	The OCO informed this person that this office is not opening investigations for individual cases in relation to DOC policies 410.030, 410.430, 410.050, 670.000 and RCW 43.06.220 in its handling of COVID-19 concerns. However, OCO 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
100.	Family member of an incarcerated person reports her loved one is housed in a unit that is on a hunger strike due to the lack of yard time allowed. Family member reports the individuals have not had yard in over a month.	The OCO informed this person that this office is not opening investigations for individual cases in relation to DOC policies 410.030, 410.430, 410.050, 670.000 and RCW 43.06.220 in its handling of COVID-19 concerns. However, OCO 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
101.	Incarcerated individual reports he was transferred from camp over a month ago and never received any of his property.	The OCO provided information regarding grieving and/or filing a tort claim to address the concern.	Information Provided
102.	Incarcerated individual reports his girlfriend showed him risqué pictures two visits in a row. DOC caught them and gave him a 30 day no visit restriction. A few days later, the individual went to the kiosk and found that DOC headquarters reviewed the video visits and added more time to the visiting suspension, a total of 180 days. Individual states DOC headquarters added more time because they reviewed multiple video visits.	The OCO contacted DOC Headquarters regarding the suspension time frames. Policy 450.300(VIII) states that the suspension time frames may vary depending on severity and number of violations that took place. The OCO shared this information with the individual and confirmed that DOC can make changes to the visitation sanction based on new information.	Information Provided
103.	Person says visitation was also denied for his two-year-old son but his J&S states that he is allowed visitation with his son. DOC claims it can override the court order in the J&S. DOC claims its decision is due to a no contact order with his wife, but no order exists. Person's wife has appealed the	The OCO was unable to identify a violation of policy. This office reviewed all pertinent documentation, visitation denial, and the SSOSA ("Special Sex Offender Sentencing Alternative") revoke. His child's mother aided him in violating the terms of his community custody agreement. This was violation of DOC	No Violation of Policy

	visitation decision. Person says that what DOC told the OCO in a previous case regarding the same concern was not true.	450.300. She is not an approved visitor; he would need to have a third party for a supervised visit with his son.	
104.	Incarcerated individual reports educator teaching his class is not grading work and has not given the class new assignments to work on. The individual filed resolution requests about this concern over a month ago and did not receive a response.	The OCO confirmed that the individual's resolution request was accepted within DOC's procedural timeframes. The OCO also provided self-advocacy information about how to address concerns like this if it happens in the future.	Information Provided
105.	Incarcerated individual requests an outside investigation of the actions DOC is taking to mitigate the tuberculosis (TB) outbreak. The individual reports that staff and incarcerated people are going untested for COVID-19 and TB. The individual is concerned that the lack of testing will lead to a larger spread of both illnesses.	The OCO staff visited the facility and spoke to the population, medical staff, and the administration to gain a better understanding of the situation and of the DOC's response. The OCO was informed by DOC staff that the facility has enough TB tests available to test the population of the entire facility, staff included. Anyone who wants to receive a TB test may request one by kiting the facility medical department.	Information Provided
106.	Patient reports that he has not received his afternoon medication for three days. He was told to take it every six hours. Pill line staff told him they do not give it out every six hours. He recently underwent his third cancer treatment. The outside provider's prescription does not match when pill line is available. Requested pain medication access in the afternoon.	Patient confirmed he received his oncology appointment and pain management plan. The OCO alerted DOC to the medication access concerns. DOC agreed to conduct a review of this patient's medications and pill line access will be reviewed by facility health services manager and headquarters staff.	Assistance Provided
107.	Incarcerated individual has complained numerous times of upper body pain. DOC has done nothing to remedy the situation.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. Patient followed up via mail stating that the concerns had been resolved.	DOC Resolved
108.	Person says the IMU handbook states that individuals in administrative segregation must have a verifiable court date within 45 days in order to access the law library. However, DOC 320.255 states that all individuals in restrictive housing will have access to the law library regardless of court date. Person says that one week they are allowed law library and the next week they are not; access depends on how staff choose to interpret the rules.	Per RCW 43.06C, the OCO may not investigate an issue until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it via the grievance process, administrative actions, and/or an appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
109.	Person states that they were recently entitled to a refund from legal financial obligations (LFOs) that were paid in the	Per RCW 43.06C, the OCO may not investigate an issue until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued

	Blake case. However, DOC took deductions from the returned LFOs.	via the grievance process, administrative actions, and/or an appellate process.	
110.	Incarcerated individual was issued a 555 infraction for possessing legal material containing another incarcerated person's information. Incarcerated individual indicated that he was using the information for his current case. Incarcerated individual believes policy is in violation of Public Records Act and Freedom of Information Act.	Person had not yet appealed infraction or submitted grievance relating to the concern. The OCO encouraged complainant to file a grievance or appeal infraction. Informed person that statute prevents this office from investigating concerns until the person has reasonably pursued internal resolution of the matter.	Information Provided
111.	The incarcerated individual needed translation services in Spanish to adequately communicate current issues with his knee that was injured and treated 20 years ago. DOC wants to assign him to an upper-level bunk but he cannot climb a ladder to reach the bunk. Needs to see health care provider for medication and or additional treatment.	The OCO provided information in Spanish regarding the need to file a medical grievance for treatment issues and to obtain a Health Services Report for a lower bunk.	Information Provided
112.	Family member of an incarcerated person reports her loved one was tested for COVID-19 with an expired COVID-19 rapid antigen test. The incarcerated individual reports that he questioned the date on the box and the DOC staff member stated that it was "just a box." Family member is concerned that DOC is using expired COVID-19 tests.	This concern was addressed by DOC in the COVID-19 call with families. DOC reported to the families that the individually wrapped testing supplies may have been condensed into an available box. The date on the box does not correspond with the dated supplies within. The OCO provided this information to the incarcerated person and their family member.	DOC Resolved
113.	Person has chronic illness with high medical needs. He has not been able to get proper medical care since he filed a grievance. Reports improper medication and medical treatment.	The OCO notified the DOC of this person's unmet medical needs. OCO review determined that the person was seen by the provider for chronic care in three of the past four months. OCO confirmed they recently filed a medical grievance regarding their catheter that has been resolved.	DOC Resolved
114.	Incarcerated individual is concerned that the DOC staff members reviewing his appeal are the same people that made the original decision.	The OCO confirmed that higher levels of management will be the ones reviewing to appeal per DOC protocol. The OCO provided information about how the appeals process functions.	No Violation of Policy
115.	Incarcerated individual reports DOC took nearly a year to provide him with a level three resolution request response. The individual does not agree with the findings of the investigation by the Resolution Department.	The OCO was able to substantiate this concern but was not able to achieve a resolution. The OCO was able to substantiate that the resolution request did not receive a response until almost a year after the individual filed the request. The OCO confirmed that the resolution investigation was conducted per policy and was assigned to the correct headquarters staff members.	Substantiated Without Resolution

116.	Incarcerated individual reports that DOC medical provider added false medical information to their medical file. The individual has tried DOC remedies such as the resolution program to resolve this concern and has been told that they cannot resolve the issue through resolutions.	The OCO's review determined that the DOC is following RCW 70.02.100 Correction or amendment of record, which states it is the provider's duty to inform the patient in writing of the provider's refusal to correct or amend the record as requested and the patient's right to add a statement of disagreement. The OCO was able to verify that DOC did review the individual's request and provided them with follow up information for next steps.	No Violation of Policy
117.	Patient reports having trouble with ear pain as well as swelling and fluid pressure in face, swelling and numbness in arms, hands, left side of body, neck pain. Impacting activities of daily living. Patient says he has been seen but is not getting treatment and does not believe medical is taking him seriously.	The OCO alerted the facility health services manager to these concerns. As a result, DOC staff met with the patient and directed him to declare a medical emergency if the pain worsened. The patient was then scheduled for an appointment with health services.	Assistance Provided
Washington Corrections Center			
118.	Person reports being tested for COVID without explanation. They were later told via kiosk that several staff members have COVID. Person states that staff are saying someone on the chain bus was positive. Person wants to know if DOC checks staff for COVID and if they were tested and vaccinated why did they get COVID?	COVID related concern. The OCO entered concern into the COVID Tracker and sent letter explaining next steps. Relayed their concern to DOC anonymously.	Information Provided
119.	Person states that they have been at the facility for 56 days and have not yet received the vaccine.	COVID related concern. The OCO entered concern into the COVID Tracker and sent letter explaining next steps. Relayed their concern to DOC anonymously.	Information Provided
120.	Incarcerated individual has taken all the necessary steps to get a facility plan created, but states no one is following through to finalize his plan.	Individual's custody facility plan had been finalized, and a transfer order was approved. He will transfer as soon as his facility is no longer in active outbreak status. This information was relayed back to the individual.	Information Provided
121.	A loved one of an incarcerated individual is concerned that the individual is in isolation because of COVID protocols after transfer from a county jail with two other individuals. One person is always sleeping on the floor. Individual requires medications that are taken daily, and he may not have them following the transfer from county jail.	DOC staff resolved the concerns prior to the OCO taking action on the complaint. The individual received the medications and was released to community custody.	DOC Resolved

122.	Person says that they were moved to the Intensive Management Unit for approximately two weeks and then they returned to their unit they asked DOC staff for their property. The sergeant returned only two folders containing documents, but not the rest of their property. Other incarcerated individual told them their property was left out in the dayroom and it was stolen. DOC staff refute this claim.	The OCO cannot provide compensation for lost or stolen items. The OCO provided self-advocacy information for filing a tort claim with the Department of Enterprise Services.	Information Provided
123.	Incarcerated individual reports that they did not receive their Economic Impact Payment.	The OCO cannot locate Economic Impact Payments. The OCO provided this person the contact information for the IRS office for Washington State residents to request Form 3911 Taxpayer Statement Regarding Refund.	Information Provided
124.	Individual has been requesting video footage of an incident at WCC. He and his family requested within the correct timelines and were told the footage was not ready to be released yet, but now are being told DOC may have purged it.	OCO does not have authority to compel public records or resolve a dispute with public records. Contact information was provided to the appropriate individual to reach out to with a complaint or resolution request on a public record denial.	Information Provided
125.	Person says they need assistance or representation filing a lawsuit against DOC.	The OCO provided the individual with information about the tort claim process and informed them that the OCO does not assist outside counsel in pursuing litigation against DOC.	Information Provided
126.	Person says that they were not given credit for time served on community custody supervision when they were in jail pending new charges.	The OCO does not have the ability to investigate an incarcerated person's sentencing structure or time calculations pertaining to community custody. The OCO provided self-advocacy and contact information for the Records division at DOC Headquarters who may be able to further investigate their calculated time was applied.	Lacked Jurisdiction
127.	Shortly after arriving at WCC, individual received an infraction due to a positive urinalysis test. The test was positive due to a treatment program the individual participated in while under county supervision, immediately before arriving at WCC. The infraction negatively impacted the individual's custody level.	The OCO notified facility administration of this concern, who acknowledged the individual's treatment records. The individual's appeal was subsequently accepted, and the infraction was overturned.	Assistance Provided
128.	Incarcerated caller reports that he has not been afforded his right to appeal a serious infraction. He has his appeal receipt however DOC will not honor it.	The OCO contacted the facility of jurisdiction, and they did not have record of the appeal. The facility agreed to accept a new copy of the appeal for consideration. Information was provided to the individual on where to send the new appeal.	Information Provided

129.	Incarcerated caller was found guilty of having paraphernalia in his cell that he claimed he did not own. Caller said staff searched multiple cells that day; he believes it was a mix-up with someone else's paraphernalia. Some of the items seized were not listed on the caller's original search report form, which was generated by staff directly after search.	The OCO could not identify a violation of policy. The OCO reviewed all disciplinary materials and applicable policy. No witness statements were requested that would have supported the individual's claim of mixed-up evidence. While evidence was not listed on the search report per DOC 420.320, it was listed in multiple others, which is in alignment with DOC policy to record evidence for infractions (DOC 420.375 - Restricted). Lack of information on one form, but supported by multiple other staff statements, would be considered harmless error, not grounds to overturn the infraction. DOC acted within policy to uphold a finding of guilt based on the evidence provided.	No Violation of Policy
130.	Incarcerated individual reports receiving an infraction for an incident that was the result of a mental health crisis. When DOC served the infraction, he was in a different facility, which impacted his ability to get witnesses. At the hearing, he was denied a mental health advisor. He attempted to request input on his mental health history to support his case but was not given helpful input.	The OCO reviewed all relevant evidence for the infraction. A staff advisor was deemed not to have been required during the hearing, which the incarcerated individual consented to. The disciplinary hearing was lacking substantive input on the person's mental health concerns, so DOC agreed to re-review with mental health staff. Ultimately, DOC declined to overturn the infraction, but committed to exploring ways for mental health staff to be more involved during the disciplinary hearing process.	No Violation of Policy
131.	Person says he was recommended for a high level of substance abuse treatment even though he does not have a history of abuse. He also claims the counselor accused him of refusing treatment.	The OCO reviewed his records. OCO review determined that this person was not recommended for high level treatment and there is no indication that he refused treatment.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
132.	Incarcerated individual is currently in administrative segregation with some privileges; their points should further increase their level. They requested a transfer to a facility with a custody level where they could be housed appropriately for their gender.	The OCO reviewed the individual's housing suitability request, which has been completed. DOC administration approved the person for transfer to a new facility at medium custody. Any further custody change would require DOC approval. The OCO is not able to independently change housing placements.	Information Provided
133.	Incarcerated individual reports that there are severe cracks in the courtyard pavement that are causing many people to get injured. Additionally, individual says that staff keep telling the incarcerated population that they do not have enough staff to allow them recreational time. Person says that the vaccine mandate will make the staff shortage an even bigger problem.	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.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued

134.	The incarcerated individual states that they were transferred to Washington from an out of state DOC facility. When they left their last facility, that state's DOC deducted money per the mandatory deduction matrix. When the incarcerated individual arrived at a Washington State DOC facility, they had additional mandatory deduction taken out of their account per Washington State's mandatory deduction matrix. The incarcerated individual does not believe it is right to have money deducted twice.	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.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
135.	Person says that unit staff are not supplying individuals with basic hygiene and communication essentials while they are in quarantine. Person says that they asked for those items while waiting for commissary, which is experiencing supply chain issues, and people may not even receive the items they ordered.	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.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
136.	Person says that they had a decent mattress, however, staff removed mattresses from several people in that unit and replaced them with older, worn-out mattresses without providing a reason. Person says this is discrimination and the facility has a stockpile of brand-new mattresses in storage, and it is cruel and unusual to make people in receiving suffer.	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.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
137.	Person says that they were in the Graduated Reentry program, but they were re-incarcerated due to a change in sponsorship eligibility. They feel that staff are not working to get them back out on the Graduated Reentry program. Person says that DOC staff threw away their grievance pertaining to this concern.	The OCO reviewed DOC records and verified that prior to the OCO taking action, this person had been released on the Graduated Reentry program to an alternate address.	DOC Resolved
138.	The incarcerated individual reports that they have been in administrative segregation for over 97 days, and they were not notified of an extension request. The incarcerated individual believes that staff misconduct is the reason why it is taking so long to move them out of segregation.	The OCO reviewed DOC records and determined that the individual was no longer under investigation at another facility and had been transferred to WCC.	DOC Resolved

139.	Incarcerated individual was transferred to WCC in order to then take a chain bus to another facility. Incarcerated individual missed the bus and is now stuck at the facility without any of their personal items. DOC staff did communicate that they will stay there pending an infraction.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process. OCO provided self-advocacy information regarding filing a grievance on this matter.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
------	---	--	-------------------------------------

Washington Corrections Center for Women

140.	The incarcerated individual states that she is having to endure constant threats from her roommate. When she alerted staff in an attempt to resolve the problem, staff refused to move the person to another room. Additionally, because of a minor infraction, she is ineligible for a courtesy room move.	The OCO reviewed the DOC's records and determined that the individual had been moved to an alternate room prior to the OCO receiving the complaint and taking action. The OCO verified that the DOC did address the individual's concern; she is no longer residing with the roommate with whom she experienced the conflict.	DOC Resolved
------	---	---	--------------

Washington State Penitentiary

141.	Incarcerated individual was not given mail when it was passed out. The individual had to confront the Correctional Officer (CO) distributing mail in order to get their mail.	Upon review, the OCO verified that the incarcerated individual received his mail that was delayed. The OCO further confirmed that the DOC Resolution Program is processing the resolutions request per the Resolution Program Manual.	No Violation of Policy
142.	Incarcerated individual says that his counselor proposed a release plan for him to be released to a DOC prior-approved residence, but the plan was denied. Incarcerated individual says that he exhausted all addresses in his county of origin after all his plans were denied. Incarcerated individual continues to get different information as to why DOC is rejecting his plans. The superintendent denied his latest plan based on his forensic psychological evaluation (FPE), but he claims that FPE is outdated.	DOC is currently within policy to deny a release plan if it does not adequately address an individual's dynamic risk factors, identified in their FPE. This is according to DOC 350.200 Transition and Release. OCO agrees that the policy surrounding consideration of plans for individuals in the incarcerated individual's position is not clear. OCO worked with DOC to identify where lack of clarity led to miscommunication for this individual about his release plans. DOC has agreed to make clarifications in the forthcoming update of the Transition and Release policy.	No Violation of Policy
143.	Incarcerated individual called family stating that he needs medical attention due to an abscess in his mouth that was painful and unbearable. He says he informed the officers and was denied care and treatment.	The OCO contacted the facility and learned that the incarcerated individual had already been seen by a doctor regarding their medical concern.	DOC Resolved
144.	Incarcerated individual received infractions when he did not come to work. The individual states that he had put in	The OCO reviewed the infraction packet. The 103 infraction was dismissed. OCO review determined that there was	No Violation of Policy

his two-week notice and the infraction was from his last day of work, when he was doing his job in the same area he had been assigned to all along. He pled not guilty and had the hearing delayed pending some video footage that was never found, yet he was still found guilty.

evidence to substantiate the 709 infraction (being in an area without authorization) when the individual was in an area that was marked "out of bounds." There was also evidence to substantiate the 810 infraction for failing to maintain employment/being terminated for negative performance when the incarcerated individual did not meet the job expectations.

145.	Incarcerated individual reports he grieved the education navigator and in response to the grievance he was infraacted for harassment. He feels the infraction was based on staff retaliation. He states he also has not received an answer to the appeal.	The OCO investigated the infraction report and related grievance documents including kiosk messages. The elements of the 896 infraction (harassment based on a person's race) were substantiated by the "some evidence" standard. The infraction was a direct result of the kiosk messages that were sent to the navigator, not as a result of the grievance. Therefore, the OCO was unable to identify any evidence of staff retaliation.	No Violation of Policy
146.	Incarcerated individual states he received two 603 infractions for drug introduction. He states the first set of sanctions were suspended due to COVID protocol but wants to know why the second set of sanctions were not suspended when they are the same infractions. He also expressed concerns about the sanctions as he is releasing soon and needs to set up a successful reentry.	The OCO contacted the facility to inquire about the second set of sanctions. DOC explained that, because the individual had been found guilty a second time for drug introduction within a 12-month period, the full mandated sanctions were imposed. Additionally, the sanctions for a 603 infraction are mandatory and cannot be lifted.	No Violation of Policy
147.	Incarcerated individual states he received an infraction for urinating outside. He states the gym door was locked and he has a health status report (HSR) that states he has an enlarged prostate and diabetes. The hearings officer said he could not recognize the other party (an officer who he requested to open the door) in the video but can recognize the incarcerated individual. Individual believes this is a racist comment and he should not have been infraacted.	The OCO reviewed the infraction concern. The infraction involved two general infractions. At this time, OCO policy only allows investigations of serious infractions. As a result, the OCO was unable to investigate this concern further.	Lacked Jurisdiction
148.	Incarcerated individual states an officer issued an infraction which states that it appeared he had handed something to another person who was caught with suboxone. Individual states he never gave this person anything, has remained infraction free for a long time, and has had no dealings with drugs. His room was searched with canines and nothing was found. He states DOC strip-	The OCO reviewed the infraction packet and determined that there was sufficient evidence to substantiate the 603 (transferring drugs) infraction. The OCO contacted the facility to inquire about the basis for the 752 (possessing an unauthorized drug) infraction. After reviewing additional information, the OCO determined that "some" evidence exists to substantiate both infractions, thereby meeting the DOC's evidentiary standard for disciplinary hearings.	No Violation of Policy

searched him twice and found nothing and never tested him for drugs.

149.	Incarcerated individual reports that he is being denied access to legal appointments due to refusing IMU housing. He has active cases with deadlines coming at the end of the month. He reports that he does not have adequate access to the Resolution Program.	The OCO spoke with the incarcerated individual's counselor about the concerns. Due to safety precautions in place to protect the individual while he was placed in the close observation area (COA), the individual was temporarily unable to access certain materials.	No Violation of Policy
150.	Incarcerated person says that DOC staff conducted a room search and but provided an incorrect search report initially. Person also noticed items were missing from their room so they filed a tort claim.	Per RCW 43.06C, OCO cannot investigate unless the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it via the grievance process, administrative actions, and/or an appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
151.	Incarcerated individual received an infraction and reports that the officer's statement in the report does not reflect what occurred during the incident.	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
152.	Person has been involved in programs to engage in self-improvement. However, following their transfer they do not have as many programming options and resources as the previous placement offered. He was transferred to a new institution when he was only a few classes away from graduating the course.	The OCO provided self-advocacy information to be considered for more programming or for a transfer that could support his programming needs. Recommended that he stay active in all planning related to classification and work with his counselor so that DOC staff have the opportunity to hear and understand his programming needs and wishes.	Information Provided
153.	Incarcerated Individual reports DOC staff instructed him to pass out food to his unit while they were on COVID-19 quarantine. Individual reports that this is not in compliance with the CDC guidelines for quarantine and refused because he did not want to get anyone sick. He is concerned that he will lose his job and/or be infraacted for not performing the duties asked of him.	The OCO alerted DOC staff to this concern. The OCO was then able to confirm that no negative action was taken against the individual for his refusal to pass out food and stay quarantined. The OCO relayed this information to the individual.	Assistance Provided
154.	Incarcerated individual was transferred to Washington State Penitentiary (WSP) and some of his personal property was confiscated as not allowed at WSP. Specifically, DOC confiscated a wooden cross and cord that was personally significant to him. Individual says they have had these items for 17 years, and up until now it had never been a problem.	The OCO was identify a violation of policy on the part of DOC staff. The OCO's review determined that the actions taken by DOC staff were within the parameters set forth in DOC Policy 440.000, which states that incarcerated individuals are provided with three options related to their confiscated property: destroy, donate, or send out at own expense. The OCO reviewed the property disposition form issued, which	No Violation of Policy

states that if no action is taken within 90 days, the property will be disposed of. The OCO contacted the WSP property room staff to inquire about the status of the confiscated property. The OCO was informed by DOC that the property had been disposed of per policy, because the WSP property staff received no further correspondence from the property owner regarding the confiscated property.

155.	Incarcerated individual reports that the population is under duress after more than two years of continuous COVID outbreaks. Lack of programming, visits and access to reentry services have greatly impacted people in Washington DOC. Feels that they are being left behind and not thought of as they sit in their cells 23 hours a day.	The OCO informed this person that this office is not opening investigations for individual cases in relation to DOC policies 410.030, 410.430, 410.050, 670.000 and RCW 43.06.220 in its handling of COVID-19 concerns. However, OCO 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
156.	Incarcerated individual requested an inventory of his property and asked to know the number of boxes he has. The individual also requested receipts showing his purchases.	The DOC resolved this complaint prior to OCO action. The OCO verified that the DOC provided the individual with his property and receipts. The OCO provided information to the individual about how to obtain this information at the facility in the future.	DOC Resolved

Abbreviations

The following are the full terms for abbreviations used in this report:

ADA: Americans with Disabilities Act

AHCC: Airway Heights Corrections Center

AO: (OCO) Assistant Ombuds

BOE: Behavioral Observation Entry

CBCC: Clallam Bay Corrections Center

CI: Correctional Industries

CO: Correctional Officer

CRC: Care Review Committee

CRCC: Coyote Ridge Corrections Center

CUS: Correctional Unit Supervisor

DOSA: Drug Offender Sentencing Alternative

EFV: Extended Family Visit

ERD: Earned Release Date

HCSC: Headquarters Community Screening Committee

HSR: Health Status Report

IU 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

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

Glossary

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.

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