

**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.

Note: The following case summaries also include OCO's closed case reviews, in which a complainant whose case was closed requests a review by the supervisor.

All published monthly reports are available on [oco.wa.gov/reports-publications/monthly-outcome-reports](https://oco.wa.gov/reports-publications/monthly-outcome-reports).

<b>Case Status</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
<b>Assistance Provided</b>	OCO, through outreach to DOC staff, was able to achieve full or partial resolution of the person's complaint.
<b>DOC Resolved</b>	Case was resolved by action of DOC staff prior to OCO action.
<b>Lack Jurisdiction</b>	Complaint did not meet OCO's jurisdictional requirements (not about an incarcerated individual, not about a DOC action, or person did not reasonably pursue grievance/appellate procedure).
<b>No Violation of Policy</b>	After reviewing all relevant documents and DOC policy, OCO staff determined that DOC policy was not violated.
<b>Unable to Substantiate</b>	Insufficient evidence existed to support the complainant's allegation.
<b>Information Provided</b>	OCO provided self-advocacy information.
<b>Substantiated</b>	OCO substantiated the concern/allegation, but it was not resolved by DOC and OCO was unable to reach a negotiated agreement.
<b>Declined, Other</b>	Some other reason existed for the closure of the case, generally release.

# Monthly Outcome Report

## January 2022

Institution of Incident	Complaint/Concern	Outcome Summary	Case Closure Reason
<b>Airway Heights Corrections Center</b>			
1.	Incarcerated patient reports receiving wrong medication at pill line twice in one day. Declared medical emergency due to negative side effects.	The OCO provided assistance. The DOC substantiated the medication error but did not identify nurse. Grievance was not appealed.	Assistance Provided
2.	Person reports both their mental health and safety were severely neglected when they were assaulted and subsequently almost forced to be placed in a situation where they would have exacerbated severe mental health symptoms. Reports that staff ignored the assault as it was happening and did not call for aid, failing to act in any way that would protect them.	The OCO provided assistance. This office notified DOC staff of these concerns. DOC staff recognized the security issue and agreed to review the situation and work to prevent this issue from happening in the future. The OCO also offered this person suggestions for effective means of notifying DOC staff of urgent concerns.	Assistance Provided
3.	Incarcerated person reports that the DOC staff person responsible for handling religious items is not allowing them to get their religious item that was ordered by an approved visitor from an approved vendor.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. Initial review of complaint revealed that the DOC has provided this person with their religious property.	DOC Resolved
4.	Incarcerated person states that their time was not calculated correctly. They have reached out to Records multiple times with no response and would like helping reaching the records department.	The OCO provided this person with the contact information for the main Records office at DOC headquarters.	Information Provided
5.	Person reports receiving an infraction but was not notified of the infraction until ten days later. DOC's computer system indicates that they had their hearing the day they were notified, but that is incorrect; person was only served infraction paperwork that day. When person asked about their hearing date, they were told they will not be having one. Person has been granted work release but they are unable to start until this infraction gets closed.	The OCO contacted the facility and learned that DOC is waiting for further information prior to scheduling the hearing. The OCO provided this information to the incarcerated individual and reminded him that he can contact this office again if he needs assistance once the hearing occurs and he pursues any available administrative remedies.	Information Provided
6.	Person was found guilty of two major infractions which resulted in losing points. Person is now being transferred to medium security and is concerned that their safety is at risk. Believes	The OCO provided information regarding the need to wait for a response to the appeal. Also advised that they may appeal their classification to the superintendent. Provided	Information Provided

	that DOC staff are purposely trying to negatively impact mental health.	information about what to do if they believe they are ever in imminent danger.	
7.	Person is being denied minimum security (MI2) for not programming. However, they were not court-mandated to take this program.	The OCO reviewed this complaint and learned that the Headquarters Community Screening Committee (HCSC) determined in 2017 that this person was not eligible for promotion to MI2 custody in compliance with DOC policy 300.380 Classification and Custody Facility Plan Review. Since that time, this decision appears to have not been reassessed. The OCO provided self-advocacy information to the incarcerated person regarding how to file a classification appeal to the HCSC requesting a re-assessment of their determination. HCSC membership has changed since 2017. This office encouraged this person to follow up with this office after completing the appeals process. Also provided this person with proper documentation needed to file a classification appeal.	Information Provided
8.	Incarcerated person wants to be able to contact his daughter to inform her that he is dying but there is a no contact order in place.	The OCO contacted facility leadership to request consideration of an exception in this situation. DOC informed this office that the DOC does not have the ability to override a no contact order as this is done through the court system. The OCO informed the incarcerated complainant that the daughter must petition the court to remove the order.	Information Provided
9.	Person reported Covid-19 concerns and concerns regarding the conduct of DOC staff in handling Covid 19 outbreaks and variants at AHCC.	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.	Lack Jurisdiction
10.	Incarcerated person wrote an appeal to DOC headquarters regarding a counselor making a mistake. Person has not heard back with a response and it has been months since the appeal was sent.	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy. This office alerted DOC that this person had not yet received a response to their appeal. DOC informed this office that the subject of this person's appeal - their Washington ONE assessment – has been reviewed multiple times by DOC and has been found to be accurate.	No Violation of Policy

11.	Person reports that they did not feel safe working in the kitchen alongside individuals from other units at the beginning of the pandemic. They notified their supervisor by kite of concerns and did not show up but also did not quit. Person was not given an infraction, but they were terminated. Additionally, DOC took away five days of earned time. They do not believe it was right for DOC to have taken away five days of earned time.	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy. The OCO's review noted that DOC is following DOC 350.100 Earned Release Time, which states that an incarcerated individual will not be eligible for earned time if they have not been involved in mandatory programming as determined through the classification process and consistent with their Custody Facility Plan. This policy refers to "refusing mandatory programming or being terminated from a program assignment for documented for documented negative or substandard performance."	No Violation of Policy
12.	Incarcerated individual states he will be released soon. He has asked for a housing voucher but his counselor says he is not eligible because he has maxed out on time. However, he says according to the policy, because he has community custody upon, he should be able to get a housing voucher	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy. The OCO contacted DOC staff affiliated with the Housing Voucher Program for clarification. DOC staff relayed that, because this individual's earned release date (ERD) and prison max dates are the same date, he will release on the prison max date without needing an approved address. The eligibility for the ERD Housing Voucher requires an approved release address and requires that the person would be at risk of remaining incarcerated past his ERD if not for housing assistance. These conditions would not be met in this case.	No Violation of Policy
13.	Incarcerated person says he caught his roommate violating a rule. He then told the cellmate that he needed to move and could not live in that cell anymore. When the cellmate informed staff that he was refusing his current housing, staff infringed the complainant for threatening the cellmate. Complainant states that he never threatened the cellmate, he just told him he could not live there anymore.	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy. The OCO reviewed the infraction packet and appeal outcome. The DOC's "some evidence" standard was met when the complainant told his cellmate he could "kick his ass" as he wanted him to leave the cell. The elements of the 663 infraction were met. Additionally, the cellmate's actions did not meet the standard for sexual assault or sexual misconduct, as explained in the infraction appeal outcome.	No Violation of Policy
<b>Brownstone - Spokane County</b>			
14.	Incarcerated individual received an infraction for introduction of contraband. He states he knew nothing about a package with his name on it that was dropped off at his work release facility. The package contained contraband inside a pack of coffee. The complainant states that the only evidence was that his name was on the package, but he had no knowledge of this contraband. He believes he was set up.	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy. The OCO reviewed the infraction packet and audio recording of the hearing. The DOC met its low evidentiary standard of "some evidence" by showing that the coffee that contained the contraband was the same type that a previous friend had dropped off for this individual, and the friend texted asking if he had received it.	No Violation of Policy

### Cedar Creek Corrections Center

15.	Incarcerated individual grieved the behavior of a correctional officer and believes he is being retaliated against by other staff. He has been written up/infracted several times since the grievance but has not had any big issues before that. Incarcerated individual was at Cedar Creek and paid to have his property sent to another facility but never received it. He is now at a third facility and is trying to get information about his property but has not received it or any information about it. Two months ago, DOC staff told him he would receive the property in approximately one week. He says his release date should be coming up but is concerned that staff retaliation will lead to extending his time.	The OCO was unable to substantiate a claim of retaliation. OCO review determined that this person's property is in long term storage at his current facility. The OCO informed the incarcerated individual of the location of his property.	Information Provided
16.	Incarcerated individual reports concerns that mail and JPay messages to significant other are being obstructed. Significant other is a former DOC employee.	The OCO's review determined that the DOC is allowing this individual to receive incoming mail from the former DOC employee, but that JPay communication is still restricted. The OCO provided this information to the incarcerated individual.	Information Provided

### Clallam Bay Corrections Center

17.	Incarcerated person reports that he quit his job in November 2021 due to COVID and tuberculosis concerns and a lack of PPE at the job. Because of this, he has been placed on non-programming cell confinement until he can show that he is programming. A counselor took him off non-programming status last month because he explained that he is pursuing education. However, another counselor then put him back on non-programming status. Being confined to his cell is affecting his mental health. He feels that the counselor who put him on cell confinement is retaliating against him.	The OCO's review determined that the DOC found this individual in compliance with DOC recommendations and removed him from the non-programming list. OCO investigation concluded that he was not put back on the list.	Information Provided
18.	Incarcerated individual reports that the mailroom staff rejected a letter he tried to send to his fiancé. The individual has appealed this decision more than once, but the rejection continues to be upheld.	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy. The OCO's review of relevant documentation determined that the letter contained sexually explicit material which is prohibited per WAC 137-48-020 and DOC 450.100, attachment 1.	No Violation of Policy
19.	Incarcerated individual ordered a book that they believe would be beneficial to help with their social skills. However, the book is	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy. According to DOC 450.100 Mail for Individuals in Prison, attachment 1 (Unauthorized Mail), the book purchased is not	No Violation of Policy

on the statewide rejection list for allegedly providing instruction on manipulation tactics.

authorized. The DOC's appeal response was adequate and within current DOC policy.

<b>Coyote Ridge Corrections Center</b>			
20.	The incarcerated person reported difficulty accessing timely dental care.	This person was released prior to the OCO taking action on the complaint.	Declined, Other
21.	Family member of incarcerated individual reports that incarcerated individual lost \$400 worth of property when he was transferred from Coyote Ridge. He has written resolution requests but has not received a response.	The incarcerated individual did not provide consent for the OCO to proceed with an investigation.	Declined, Other
22.	Incarcerated patient went to an outside provider for shoulder surgery. Since his return to prison, health services is not providing him with his pain medication or antibiotics.	The incarcerated individual refused the OCO's letter requesting additional information and did not provide additional information by another means.	Declined, Other
23.	Incarcerated individual states that he lost property when moved from Coyote Ridge. He submitted a grievance as well as a tort claim.	OCO reviewed documentation related to grievance. Grievance not accepted because not filed within 90 days of property missing. Provided information to individual regarding alternative self-advocacy measures available to him.	Information Provided
24.	Incarcerated individual has submitted a public disclosure request and is questioning the number of pages that DOC is trying to send them. They believe they are being sent extra copies, which they do not need.	The OCO's review determined that the incarcerated person had not yet appealed. The OCO informed him that, per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), he must appeal before the OCO is able to investigate the concern. This office provided the individual with information related to DOC 280.510 and the procedure to appeal a public disclosure request.	Information Provided
25.	Incarcerated individual has been pending a transfer to a facility closer to their family for six months. Individual reports that other individuals are being transferred to the facilities they are waiting to go to. DOC staff cannot provide an answer to him when he asks why he has not been moved.	The incarcerated individual was advised that OCO often is unable to assist with complaints related to delays in institutional assignment or pending transfers unless the DOC is violating a policy, state law, or administrative code by determining facility placement. The OCO provided the incarcerated individual with self-advocacy options including being sure to notify his classification counselor regarding any concerns related to an institutional placement and although facility assignments cannot be appealed, he can reach out to the manager of the DOC Headquarters Classification Unit, to relay concerns and any circumstances that he believes would speak to his need to be placed at a different facility.	Information Provided

26.	Incarcerated individual is now eligible for camp, but would like to stay at their current facility so they can access the law library.	The OCO provided information regarding the necessary internal resolution processes that the individual must pursue in order for the OCO to be able to investigate.	Information Provided
27.	Incarcerated individual expected to receive a birthday card from a family member who lives out of state. The individual received a rejection from the mailroom for a greeting card but information on the rejection did not match the family member's name or address. The individual and his family contacted the person named on the form and confirmed that she had not tried to send mail to him. He states that this person reported that she has not sent mail to any facility. Family later confirmed that the greeting card from family member had been returned to family.	The incarcerated person did not pursue internal resolution of this concern by appealing the mail rejection. Per RCW 43.06(c)(2)(b) the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal appellate process.	Lack Jurisdiction
28.	Incarcerated individual reported concerns about DOC scanning outgoing legal mail and then rejecting it.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate a violation of policy by DOC. Per DOC Policy 590.500 and 450.100(4)(A), DOC staff must confirm that the contents of the mail qualify as legal mail and do not contain contraband.	No Violation of Policy
29.	Incarcerated individual is concerned about mailroom staff conduct and the process of a public disclosure request (PDR) being rejected.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO's review determined that the individual was advised of the protocol for sending out rejected mail but failed to follow DOC 450.100 by sending a kite and postage transfer to the mailroom. As a result, the PDR was destroyed once it had been kept beyond the 30 day hold time.	No Violation of Policy
30.	Incarcerated person reports that the DOC is not giving jail time credit that was earned in jail prior to submitting a plea.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate a violation of policy by DOC. This office determined that time calculations were reviewed by DOC headquarters and the individual was notified of this. OCO then re-opened the complaint and reviewed it again with DOC staff and determined that the calculations were made according to policy. Based on RCW 9.94A.505(6), the sentencing court will give an incarcerated individual credit for all confinement time served before the sentencing if that confinement was solely in regard to the offense for which the individual is being sentenced.	No Violation of Policy

31.	Incarcerated individual reports an ongoing problem with the mailroom and DOC staff. After being denied mail, they submitted complaints to DOC headquarters staff as well as the OCO. Following this, the incarcerated individual received behavioral observation entries (BOEs) without being notified. The lack of notification meant that the person had no chance to contest them.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO reviewed the person’s BOE history and was unable to substantiate the individual’s concern about retaliation. The OCO reviewed all mail rejections provided by the facility mailroom and determined that each rejection had been due to violations of DOC policy and the person’s Judgment and Sentence (J & S).	No Violation of Policy
32.	Incarcerated individual reports concerns about a grievance related to religious items he not allowed to possess.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO reviewed all documents and correspondence related to this grievance. The religious item is larger than the item that is allowed, was not ordered via an approved vendor, and was not ordered by a direct family member. The reasons for denial of the religious item were within the guidelines set forth by DOC Policy 560.200.	No Violation of Policy
33.	Incarcerated individual received an infraction for introducing drugs/drug paraphernalia. The individual reports that he had moved units and had only taken a change of clothes and medications – the rest of his belongings had stayed at his prior housing assignment. After nine days, DOC staff brought him his belongings. The property was searched in an unsecure location and along with the belongings of other incarcerated individuals. Several items in his box did not belong to him and some items were missing.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO reviewed the infraction packet and hearing audio and determined that the DOC had met the “some evidence” standard to uphold the infraction.	No Violation of Policy
34.	Incarcerated person reports that the emergency doors in Sage Unit are locked.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO reviewed the grievance response and contacted the facility for additional information. The OCO’s review determined that this concern had previously been raised with the fire department and that the concern had been found to be unsubstantiated at that time.	No Violation of Policy
35.	Incarcerated individual reports that a resolution program staff person refuses to send his resolution appeal to a supervisor. He states that he should be able to grieve the fact that he cannot challenge an infraction he received as a result of wrongful health disclosure.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO reviewed all grievances and infraction documents related to this concern. The OCO informed the individual that he cannot use the grievance process to challenge an infraction, but he may appeal it. The infraction was a result of a message that met the infraction guidelines for harassing/threatening language.	No Violation of Policy

## Monroe Correctional Complex

36.		Incarcerated person reported that DOC had terminated visitations with his wife and children due to language used during a video visit.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO notified the DOC of this concern. DOC staff created a pathway for the individual to restore his visits.	Assistance Provided
37.	Intensive Management Unit	Incarcerated person states they have extreme mental health difficulties and would like assistance transferring back to a residential treatment unit setting.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO reviewed this person's custody facility plan and determined that he must complete programming before he can be considered for transfer or placement back into the residential treatment unit. This office wrote this person a letter with this information.	DOC Resolved
38.	Intensive Management Unit	This person needs to provide proof of incarceration to the Social Security Administration (SSA) because the SSA has his Social Security Number as being assigned to a deceased person. This letter would need to come from DOC's record department.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO alerted DOC records staff of this problem. The DOC Records Department agreed to provide a Certificate of Offender Status to the individual that he may submit to SSA.	Assistance Provided
39.	Special Offender Unit	Person states he is being harassed by custody staff because he is Black and because he has a life sentence.	OCO review noted that issue had been addressed and incarcerated individual had withdrawn his grievance on the matter prior to the OCO's investigation.	Declined, Other
40.		Incarcerated individual states that he has been mistreated due to a lack of mental and medical health support.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO's review determined that the individual has access to mental health services. Additional concerns addressed in his grievance are being currently under review by facility leadership via the Resolution Program.	DOC Resolved
41.		Incarcerated patient reports that DOC changed his PULHES code to L2, meaning that he cannot navigate stairs. He was approved to transfer to an area better suited to meet this need but he has not been moved yet. Patient says that DOC staff have identified Twin Rivers Unit as a possible housing assignment, but he needs to be at a facility without stairs.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO's review determined that this person was moved and has active health status reports (HSRs) reflecting his housing needs.	DOC Resolved
42.	Twin Rivers Unit	Incarcerated patient has multiple health issues, including joint mobility problems and associated pain. Physical therapy has not relieved pain. Provider indicated that he may be eligible for injections to address the pain but none have been scheduled.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The individual has been seen by medical staff and he is receiving injections.	DOC Resolved

43.	Washington State Reformatory	Individual reports that he cannot have visits with his child's mother because of a false document DOC made alleging that she is a victim of his crime. Child's mother has appealed the denial of visitation.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The DOC is willing to re-evaluate the visitation application if a police report is submitted. This office informed the individual of the next step for this process.	DOC Resolved
44.	Intensive Management Unit	Incarcerated individual has been in the intensive management unit (IMU) for nearly one year. Their facility plan and transfer were approved months ago but they are still in IMU. The other people who were placed in IMU at the same time have all been moved out. They think it might be due to the fact that they are transgender.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. This individual has been transferred to another facility.	DOC Resolved
45.	Intensive Management Unit	Loved one contacted the OCO with concerns about their family member who had been placed in IMU due to COVID quarantine procedures. The incarcerated individual had tested negative so they did not understand why DOC put them in segregation.	The OCO informed the complainant that the facility is now off of quarantine status and the family member has returned to their original unit.	Information Provided
46.	Intensive Management Unit	Loved one reported that incarcerated individual was sent to IMU because his cellmate tested positive for COVID. He has been there for nearly a month and has tested negative multiple times, but still has not been allowed to return to his unit. Other people have been allowed to return.	The OCO provided information to loved one. The facility has been taken off of quarantine status and individual was returned to their unit.	Information Provided
47.	Twin Rivers Unit	Complainant reported that incarcerated person was forcibly removed from his cell. His cellmate was told he tested positive for COVID by DOC staff. DOC staff then said that he would be transferred to IMU and placed in solitary confinement. The incarcerated person states that the recent COVID response at Monroe has led to a bizarre and sadistic response by DOC staff. He wonders why individuals who test negative and have no symptoms are being put into solitary confinement.	The OCO provided information to the complainant. Informed this person that the Monroe quarantine status was over and that the incarcerated person had left IMU.	Information Provided
48.	Intensive Management Unit	Caller reports that her incarcerated loved one has been held in IMU for months pending transfer but has not been transferred. He was only supposed to be in IMU for a short time.	The OCO provided information to the caller that incarcerated loved one has been promoted to medium custody and will be transferred. He declined to be transferred to the transfer pod.	Information Provided
49.	Intensive Management Unit	Incarcerated person has concerns about two infractions that are causing him problems with his points and, in turn, his classification. The first infraction resulted in a loss of 10 points. He states he should now be eligible to get them back because	The OCO provided information to incarcerated individual about a timeline for eligibility for him to request restoration of up to 30 days of lost good conduct time if he complies with the approved pathway.	Information Provided

more than six months have elapsed, but his counselor disagrees. He is currently in segregation due to the second infraction. The DOC states that this new infraction prevents him from getting his points back for the prior infraction. He believes that DOC violated policy with the hearing because they did not get the proper witness statements, which has resulted in him being demoted custody levels.

50.	MSU	The complainant has a loved one at Monroe. The complainant is concerned about the person administering the COVID tests, how the tests are being performed, and the potential for cross-contamination.	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
51.	Special Offender Unit	Incarcerated individual reports that facility operations for administering medication are at the facility's convenience and not as prescribed. Individual says that people who are prescribed thyroid hormone medication are instructed to take it on an empty stomach and to wait one hour after administration for the medication to be absorbed before eating. Facility will only administer medication at mealtime when mainline has been secured. Individual says this affects all incarcerated individuals.	Individual did not file grievance but wanted to bring issues to the OCO's attention. The OCO provided information to the individual regarding the tort claim process.	Information Provided
52.	Special Offender Unit	Incarcerated individual reports that they were sexually harassed by DOC staff.	The OCO informed the individual that there is an open DOC PREA (Prison Rape Elimination Act) investigation that has been assigned to the facility superintendent. The OCO may review the complaint once the PREA investigation has concluded.	Information Provided
53.	Washington State Reformatory	Incarcerated individual reports being forced to pay for copies of court documents that were ultimately e-filed. The purpose of e-filing is so that individuals do not have to pay filing fees. Individual has grieved and appealed the issue but it has not been resolved, and would like further assistance.	The OCO reviewed the resolution request that this person submitted. The Appellate Court Inmate E-filing Pilot Project guidelines state that all e-filing documentation must be submitted one-sided. Because this person wrote on both sides of the paper, DOC had to make one-sided copies and then charged for that service. The OCO explained this information to the individual.	Information Provided

54.	Twin Rivers Unit	Incarcerated individual states that they were given a pathway to earn 210 days of good conduct time (GCT). Due to COVID, many of the classes were canceled and they were not able to complete the pathway. They have been denied their GCT and would like this issue reconsidered since it was out of their control.	The OCO's review determined that the individual still has time to complete the pathway in order to restore his GCT.	Information Provided
55.	Twin Rivers Unit	Incarcerated person says that mail sent to him from his friend was rejected without further reason other than "Positive per K-9." He attempted to grieve the application of the policy but was misunderstood by the resolution specialist: he was grieving the application of the policy, not the denial itself, although he did appeal that. He had grieved the fact that the DOC had not articulated a reason for the mail item being tagged as "positive."	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO's review determined that the mail item had been rejected due to an unknown substance.	No Violation of Policy
56.	Twin Rivers Unit	Incarcerated patient reported that they had been ordered treatment following a medical emergency but they had not received the treatment and the provider had not followed up with them for months.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO's review determined that treatment had been approved for this patient but the scheduled appointment for treatment had been cancelled due to quarantine. This office informed the patient that DOC staff had indicated that the appointment will be rescheduled once quarantine is lifted.	No Violation of Policy
57.	Washington State Reformatory	Incarcerated person states that he was not fed lunch or dinner on Thanksgiving Day due to DOC staff moving people around during the quarantine. Staff justified the missed meals by stating that they were following statutory and Department of Health guidance. The person understands but wanted the OCO to be aware of this. He believes that meals and other basic care should not be overlooked; that all incarcerated people should be included in holiday meals.	The OCO was able to substantiate this concern, but was not able to achieve a resolution. The OCO alerted DOC leadership to this concern.	Substantiated
<b>Olympic Corrections Center</b>				
58.		Incarcerated person reports that he was missing 91 days of good conduct time from when he went to the Snohomish County Jail. He believes his earned release date has been calculated incorrectly. He attempted to grieve the concern but was told it was not a grievable issue.	The OCO's review determined that the individual had lost 91 days of good conduct time as a result of one major and one serious infraction. The OCO provided this information to the individual.	Information Provided

**OTHER Jails**

59.	Incarcerated individual was involved in an incident at a county jail that involved excessive use of force, which resulted in injury. They want to pursue legal remedies.	The OCO lacks jurisdiction to investigate this complaint because the complaint relates to an action taken by an agency other than the Washington State Department of Corrections. The OCO provided the individual with self-advocacy information and contact information to the ombuds office in the county where the use of force occurred.	Information Provided
-----	--	--	----------------------

### Stafford Creek Corrections Center

60.	Incarcerated patient has requested reading glasses. He wants to purchase eyeglasses but is concerned that he must obtain multiple levels of DOC approval.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO alerted DOC staff to this patient's need for reading glasses. The DOC agreed to allow him to purchase through store on a one-for-one basis (turn in old pair for new pair).	Assistance Provided
61.	Family member of incarcerated individual reported that the individual is experiencing harassment and retaliation by the DOC. Family member reported that some of his property had been taken and his phone calls are being cut short.	This office contacted the incarcerated person to obtain permission to investigate. The individual did not respond to OCO's request within the specified timeframe. The OCO encouraged the individual to contact this office if they would like to request assistance.	Declined, Other
62.	Family member of incarcerated individual report that he had been transferred to a facility that has a COVID outbreak and is now on lock down without his property. He has been housed in a cell with two other individuals who have COVID. Family also expressed concerns that he is now housed a long distance from his family, and his family will not be able to visit him so far away.	This office contacted the incarcerated person to obtain permission to investigate. The OCO's review then determined that the person had not yet pursued administrative remedies available to him for these concerns. The OCO provided self-advocacy information to the individual regarding the necessary administrative processes to undertake.	Information Provided
63.	Incarcerated individual questions why his grievances are not moving forward through the Resolution Program. He would like to file a complaint with this office regarding medical concerns and believes resolution staff are retaliating against him.	The OCO's review determined that the individual's grievances were not overdue according to the Resolution Program rules. The OCO informed the person that one of the grievances was under review at the time this office inquired about its status. The OCO opened a separate investigation into the medical concerns mentioned in his grievance as requested. The OCO was unable to substantiate the allegation of retaliation based on the information provided.	Information Provided
64.	Complainant states that incarcerated individual has been in segregation since mid-November. Complainant says this person was told they are being moved to a different prison and would like to know when they are being transferred.	The OCO provided the complainant with information about DOC policy 320.200 Administrative Segregation.	Information Provided

65.	Incarcerated person reports that their property was thrown away without a disposition or show of proof.	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy. The OCO informed the individual that the review conducted by this office noted that the individual had indicated to the Department of Enterprise Services (the entity responsible for tort claim processing) that the items had been found. Because of this, DES did not provide compensation for the items.	Information Provided
66.	Individual was supposed to be released last month but DOC approved housing addresses continue to be denied. He is not being allowed to return to the county where he has community support because the victim resides in the county. Individual questions the validity of the denials for addresses in other counties.	The OCO's review determined that the individual had not grieved the counselor's actions or inactions and had not appealed the reentry plan denial. The OCO provided information regarding the need to pursue administrative remedies.	Information Provided
67.	Complainant states that incarcerated individual is being held an extra 28 days for a possession charge that had been vacated from his record.	The OCO's review determined that this person's earned release date had been changed due to a recent infraction that resulted in a 45-day loss of good time. The OCO provided this information to the complainant.	Information Provided
68.	Incarcerated individual has been in administrative segregation for more than three months and has questions about process.	This person has spent a total of five months in the IMU and is approved for transfer. The OCO provided self-advocacy information regarding DOC policy 320.200 Administrative Segregation.	Information Provided
69.	Incarcerated individual had an outside sleep study conducted but stated that the results were taking months to receive. He was concerned he should have already received a CPAP machine.	The OCO provided self-advocacy information to patient regarding how to obtain the records from the outside clinic from DOC health services. Subsequently, this office verified that patient obtained information from the clinic and received a CPAP machine.	Information Provided
70.	Incarcerated individual states that he believes he is being punished multiple times for the same action. He says that he committed a single offense. He further states that this is unjust and abusive treatment by the DOC. His concern was that he was unfairly terminated from a Correctional Industries job.	The OCO's review determined that this individual received a non-CI job after being terminated per policy. The OCO informed the individual that DOC staff have indicated that once his current job assignment expires, he will be placed on the list for a Correctional Industries job.	Information Provided
71.	Incarcerated person states that his grievance has been at level III for several months. Grievance relates to OMNI having his Social Security Number (SSN), family addresses, and other personal information available to everyone who has OMNI access. He	The OCO provided information to the individual regarding the process for making a public records request for that information. This office also provided steps for requesting to review their central and medical files.	Information Provided

wants to know what agencies have access to that information and why they need it. If he cannot have a list of the people/agencies with access to OMNI, he wants to know why he cannot.

72.	A family member of an incarcerated individual called with concerns regarding automatic payments made through Connect Network that were not received by the individual.	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. Connect Network is a third-party entity that allegedly provides reduced-price phone services for incarcerated people. They have no affiliation with the institutions or contracted vendors like GTL or JPay.	Lack Jurisdiction
73.	Individual says he was attacked in the dayroom by another individual. He was put in solitary confinement and his good time was taken from him even though he stated he was not the aggressor. He requested that the OCO review the video and prove he was acting in self-defense.	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy. The OCO reviewed the evidence and the video. The "some evidence" standard was met and DOC has therefore upheld the infraction.	No Violation of Policy
74.	Person states he is experiencing concerning physical and mental health symptoms and is having trouble accessing care.	The OCO could not substantiate a violation of the DOC Health Plan. The OCO verified that this individual has been followed up on by providers.	No Violation of Policy
75.	Individual was found guilty of having "pruno," but states that he was not involved in making it and was not aware it was in his cell. His cellmate signed a statement accepting responsibility for the pruno, but the individual was still found guilty on appeal.	The was unable to substantiate a violation of policy. The OCO reviewed the disciplinary materials. Although the cellmate did sign a statement accepting full responsibility for the pruno, the DOC is not bound by the WAC to find the infractioned individual innocent. The DOC was within policy to uphold the infraction.	No Violation of Policy
76.	Individual reports he has filed numerous complaints reporting headache, dizziness, burning eyes, and shortness of breath due to exposure to carbon monoxide from a cracked heat exchanger. The tester was placed high, not low, to the ground. A review of the medical kites and complaints will reveal that there is an ongoing problem with exposure.	Due to the nature of the physical symptoms reported, this office immediately contacted the superintendent of the facility. However, based on the information provided to the OCO, there was insufficient evidence to substantiate the complaint.	Unable to Substantiate

### Washington Corrections Center

77.	Patient's reports that DOC-issued Durable Medical equipment (DME) was left behind when the patient was transferred.	The OCO provided assistance. OCO's review substantiated that the patient's DME had been left at prior facility. The OCO alerted DOC to this concern and subsequently was	Assistance Provided
-----	---	--	---------------------

		notified by DOC staff that the department was shipping the patient's DME to the patient's new facility.	
78.	Family member expressed concern that their loved one was receiving threats in their current housing placement. Family members had reached out to DOC to alert them of possible threat to the loved one's safety, but he had not been transferred for his safety.	The individual was transferred into protective custody soon after the family members reached out to our office. The individual will remain there until he can be transferred to a different facility.	DOC Resolved
79.	Complainant reports that she had an extended family visit (EFV) with her husband and tested positive for COVID four days later. The husband was sent to quarantine without having a positive test due to the close contact during the EFV. Family member alleges that she contracted COVID from staff at the facility, after poor staff mask compliance.	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
80.	Incarcerated person reports that, during a review for programming, they were told they have 23 negative behavioral observation entries (BOEs), only two of which had been appealed. Person states they were not given notification for those BOEs or chance to appeal. Person asked that the negative BOEs be removed because of the failure to follow policy.	The informed the individual that they have the opportunity to bring each one individually to the Correctional Program Manager (CPM) and appeal, after explaining the lack of notification. This is the resolution DOC agreed to for addressing historic BOEs after OCO's 2019 investigation.	Information Provided
81.	Individual has a two-year sanction from a past infraction that prevents him from changing classification levels. He asked to remove the sanction so he can have an opportunity to do release programs in preparation for re-entry.	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy. This office previously reviewed the infraction that led to the sanction, and DOC was unwilling to overturn that finding. Because the sanctions for that infraction are mandatory, DOC is within policy to uphold the sanctions when DOC staff determine that the sanctions are appropriate.	No Violation of Policy
82.	Incarcerated individual claimed their access to the law library was being restricted. The individual sent multiple requests to access the law library, but stated they were only called out to go once.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the complaint due to insufficient evidence. The individual's grievance response contained a thorough review of kites received and responded to; DOC has record of the individual receiving a response to all kites received and going to the law library twice. At this time, OCO does not have any additional information that would substantiate a claim that the individual's access to the law library has been impaired.	Unable to Substantiate

## Washington State Penitentiary

83.	Loved one expressed concern about assaults that occurred at WSP and another facility. As a result of these assaults, this person's loved one was infractioned for a fighting when he was defending himself.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO alerted the DOC to concerns related to this infraction, and the DOC agreed to dismiss it. The DOC has now implemented a GVRS review.	Assistance Provided
84.	Incarcerated individual received infractions for using force and/or coercion and would like them to be investigated further. He believes that staff is retaliating against him.	The DOC resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on the complaint.	DOC Resolved
85.	Individual submitted a complaint regarding physical therapy and recordkeeping on the part of the therapist.	The OCO informed the individual that this office does not have the authority to change records. Provided patient with next steps towards potential resolution.	Information Provided
86.	Incarcerated person believes their earned resolution date (ERD) is incorrect. This person had been in a program that was suspended for two months due to COVID-19. Because of that lost time from the program this person still had earned time taken away.	The incarcerated person had not pursued internal administrative remedies available to them. This office provided information about filing a resolution request regarding this concern.	Information Provided
87.	Incarcerated person reports that a mental health counselor has received personal gifts from incarcerated people and is fraternizing with the incarcerated population which is against policy. Incarcerated person believes they are not being treated fairly because they are not giving the counselor gifts.	The incarcerated person had not pursued internal administrative remedies available to them. This office provided information about filing a resolution request regarding this concern.	Information Provided
88.	Incarcerated person reports that he was bullied by another incarcerated person. After a brief altercation, they were placed in segregated housing. The person appealed the infraction which was overturned, but still lost job and some personal property.	The OCO's review determined that this individual is on the list to receive a job. However, the process has been slowed due to the COVID-19 outbreak. This office provided this information to the individual. The OCO also informed the individual that this office will consider investigating the property concern once the person pursues appropriate administrative remedies.	Information Provided
89.	Person reports that DOC is holding him with no legal authority.	The OCO explained that RCW 43.06C prohibits this office from investigating a person's underlying criminal conviction. The OCO provided alternate self-advocacy options for this person to pursue.	Information Provided
90.	Incarcerated person's request to be transferred to the west side of the state in order to be closer to their children was denied.	The OCO was unable to identify a violation of policy. This office provided self-advocacy options to the individual related to DOC policy 300.380.	Information Provided

He claims to have enough points and is not requesting to go to camp. He would like the OCO to look into this matter.

91.	Individual reports that the Department of Enterprise Services (DES) investigated his claim for a lost television but interviewed the wrong people. He wants to be reimbursed and have the tort investigation looked at correctly.	The OCO does not have jurisdiction to investigate tort claims as those are not handled by the DOC. This office recommended contacting the DES office to work with them on the investigation.	Lack Jurisdiction
92.	Individual reports having multiple medical issues at every facility they have been at and has not received any care that is sufficient to resolve their ailments. Individual does not think DOC providers take his illness seriously; he would like to see an offsite doctor.	The OCO's review determined that the patient had not adequately pursued internal administrative remedies. Additionally, OCO review noted that patient had requested specific testing for suspected illness many months ago and that the results were confirmed in two subsequent tests as negative. Patient did not pursue or request any appeal or additional remedy.	Lack Jurisdiction
93.	Person reports that DOC denied his wife's visit. Couple alleges that the DOC has indicated that the denial is due to her involvement in the commission of crime, but husband and wife both deny this.	Person's wife has been identified as a co-defendant in the current conviction for which he is serving time. Per DOC policy 450.300, people involved in a person's current conviction cannot be approved visitors. This office provided some options for self-advocacy measures.	No Violation of Policy
94.	Person received infraction for threatening. He reports that he had been off his medication when it occurred and this fact was not considered in the hearing.	The OCO could not substantiate a violation of policy. The OCO reviewed the infraction and discussed the medication concern with appropriate team members. The threatening statements substantiate the infraction as they were to both other incarcerated individuals and staff members, were specific in nature, and had racial motivations. Additionally, the threats do not appear to be related to being on said medication.	No Violation of Policy
95.	Individual believes that infraction for fighting was unfairly given as officers who infringed him were not on duty at the time of the alleged infraction.	The OCO could not substantiate a violation of policy. The OCO reviewed the infraction packet and hearing audio. The DOC appears to have met the "some evidence" standard based on evidence of photos showing marks consistent with a fight.	No Violation of Policy
96.	Incarcerated person was found guilty of some infractions. Person served their punishment but was later contacted and told that because they had a job and were enrolled in school they were going to be Assigned to Cell (ATC). Person does not	The OCO could not substantiate a violation of policy. The OCO spoke directly with DOC for additional information. The "Assigned to Cell" is a program alternative as a result of the infraction; it is not a sanction.	No Violation of Policy

understand where ATC is coming from and is concerned it is double punishment for the same incident.

---

97.	Incarcerated individual entered DOC custody with a minimum custody score. Staff held a meeting that changed the person from minimum to close custody. In the meeting notes it was noted that the individual had agreed to the plan. However, the incarcerated person reports that he was not present during the meeting.	The OCO was unable to substantiate a violation of policy. The OCO communicated with DOC regarding the individual's custody level. Based on the behavior that sent this person back to DOC custody, DOC headquarters staff decided close custody was the most appropriate.	No Violation of Policy
-----	--	---	------------------------

## 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

**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

**IIU or I&I:** DOC's Intelligence and Investigations Unit ("Intelligence & Investigations")

**J&S:** Judgment and Sentence

**MCC:** Monroe Correctional Complex

**MCCCW:** Mission Creek Corrections Center for Women

**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

**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.