Office of the Corrections OMBUDS

Monthly Outcome Report

September 2026

UNEXPECTED FATALITY REVIEWS: 2

CASE INVESTIGATIONS: 108

Assistance Provided: 13

Information Provided: 28

DOC Addressed the Complaint: 24

Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate: 16

No Violation of DOC Policy: 27

INTAKE INVESTIGATIONS: 122

Declined: 13

No Jurisdiction: 25

Complaint Withdrawn: 24

Technical Assistance Provided: 60

TOTAL RESOLVED INVESTIGATIONS: 232

Monthly Outcome Report: September 2026

	Complaint Summary	Outcome Summary	Case Closure Reason
Unexpected Fatality Reviews			
1.	Incarcerated individual passed away while in DOC custody.	This case was reviewed by the Unexpected Fatality Review Committee, consisting of the OCO, DOC, Department of Health, and Health Care Authority. A public report regarding UFR 25-027 was delivered to the Governor and state legislators this month. It is also available in prison Law Libraries and at the end of the OCO's Monthly Outcome Report. The UFR Committee made two recommendations: 1. implement a form to standardize and document the communication of the Mental Health Aftercare Plan to housing unit personnel when an individual is discharged from the close observation area, and 2. add a distinct visual indicator within the electronic case management system to identify individuals who have been recommended for shared housing as a protective factor for suicide.	Unexpected Fatality Review
2.	Incarcerated individual passed away while in DOC custody.	This case was reviewed by the Unexpected Fatality Review Committee, consisting of the OCO, DOC, Department of Health, and Health Care Authority. A public report regarding UFR-26-003 was delivered to the Governor and state legislators this month. It is also available in prison Law Libraries and at the end of the OCO's Monthly Outcome Report. The UFR Committee made three recommendations: 1. DOC should explore options to formalize multidisciplinary care planning that integrates input from medical, psychiatric, and nursing teams to ensure holistic assessment and care planning, 2. DOC nursing leadership should review and update the Restrictive Housing Assessment and Daily Wellness Checks Nursing Protocol N-2008.001 to define the intent of the assessment and provide detailed guidance on the clinical indicators nurses must consider when evaluating an individual for restrictive housing placement, and 3. DOC Chief of Psychiatry should present a clinical overview of delusional disorder diagnoses at the DOC Behavioral Health Grand Rounds.	Unexpected Fatality Review
Case Investigations			
Airway Heights Corrections Center			
3.	A loved one reported concerns about an incarcerated individual's mental health and access to mental health medications.	The OCO provided assistance by reaching out to DOC staff, who got this individual scheduled with mental health staff to assess for a referral to psychiatry. OCO staff confirmed in DOC records that these appointments have been made.	Assistance Provided
4.	Person reported concerns about not receiving accommodations for his disability. Person also expressed concerns about his disability not being noted on his ID and said that he has received infractions related to	The OCO provided assistance by working with facility staff regarding his concerns and accommodation needs. The OCO reviewed DOC records, including Accommodation Status Reports (ASR), Health Status Reports (HSR), and resolution requests. OCO staff reached out to facility staff, who were willing to approve him for a new ID that noted his disability. After OCO request, facility staff met with this individual regarding his accommodation concerns. The OCO was unable to substantiate that he received infractions related to his disability.	Assistance Provided

	his disability.		
5.	Person reported concerns about his wheelchair and said he has been unable to get his concerns addressed with Health Services.	The OCO provided assistance by working with facility staff to get his wheelchair assessed, which led to his wheelchair being replaced. The OCO reviewed DOC records and reached out to facility staff, who scheduled him with his provider for a wheelchair assessment. After this assessment, facility staff told the OCO that his wheelchair will be replaced.	Assistance Provided
6.	External person reported their loved one has been facing delays in seeing a specialist. The impacted person requested that he receive an MRI and consultation with a surgeon.	DOC addressed this concern prior to OCO action. OCO staff reviewed the person's records and consultations and found that the person was seen by their medical provider shortly after the issue was reported to the OCO and the requested consultation requests were submitted. OCO staff verified the person received the requested MRI and that the specialist provided treatment recommendations. Treatment recommendations must be reviewed for coverage by the DOC Health Plan and may require approval through the Care Review Committee (CRC).	DOC Addressed the Complaint
7.	Incarcerated individual shared concerns regarding DOC not providing them with safe harbor protection despite being labeled as needing such.	DOC staff addressed this concern prior to OCO action. Following a review of DOC records, this office was able to confirm that this individual had submitted a request to receive protective custody and was approved for protective custody.	DOC Addressed the Complaint
8.	Person reported concerns about his dentures not fitting correctly.	DOC addressed this concern prior to OCO outreach. The OCO reached out to DOC staff, who confirmed that this individual had been seen by the denturist to correct the fitting of the dentures. OCO staff confirmed this appointment and follow-up appointments in DOC records.	DOC Addressed the Complaint
9.	Patient reports concerns about multiple chronic health issues and requested an hour long appointment with his provider to discuss all the issues at once.	DOC addressed the complaint prior to OCO action. The OCO reviewed the resolution request, which was closed as informally resolved, then confirmed the patient was scheduled with his provider. The patient was seen shortly after opening a case with the OCO about this concern. The OCO provided information to the patient about how to request individual appointments for chronic conditions if the provider is unwilling to refer the patient for an extended appointment.	DOC Addressed the Complaint
10.	Person reported concerns about getting on the Medication Assisted Treatment (MAT) Program.	DOC addressed this concern prior to OCO outreach. The OCO reviewed DOC records and confirmed that this individual has been screened for and has begun the MAT program.	DOC Addressed the Complaint
11.	Incarcerated individual shared concerns regarding DOC not allowing them to drop out and housing them in a place they are unsafe. This individual also shared that DOC is not getting rid of their security threat group (STG) tag.	DOC staff addressed this concern prior to OCO action. Following a review of DOC records, this office was able to confirm that this individual's safety concerns were validated and they are undergoing a custody facility plan (CFP) to move them to a location they will be safe. This office also provided this individual with information that they can utilize to request their STG tag removal.	DOC Addressed the Complaint
12.	Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding wanting to return to a camp custody level.	The OCO reviewed the individual's placement and confirmed that they were returned to a camp custody level.	DOC Addressed the Complaint
13.	Incarcerated individual shared concerns regarding DOC validating their safety	DOC staff addressed this concern prior to OCO action. Following a review of DOC records, this office was able to confirm that this individual has been moved.	DOC Addressed the

	concerns but not moving them.		Complaint
14.	Incarcerated individual shared concerns regarding wanting their medical records.	The OCO provided information regarding how to obtain their medical records. This office informed this individual that the OCO does not provide DOC records and that they must speak with the DOC medical team to obtain their personal medical records.	Information Provided
15.	Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding wanting to transfer to another state.	The OCO reviewed the headquarters community screening committee (HCSC) decision for consideration of hardship transfer and confirmed that HCSC denied the out of state placement due to the receiving state denying incoming transfers at this time. The OCO cannot impact this classification decision.	Information Provided
16.	Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding getting a WAC 603 where the appeal was made after the WAC changes had been implemented.	The OCO reviewed the infraction materials and confirmed that the infraction incident occurred prior to the WAC changes, thus the infraction was properly written and upheld as a WAC 603 as any changes to 603s are based on the date of the incident.	Information Provided
17.	Individual reported that they were given a security threat group (STG) tag, but says they are not an STG member.	The OCO contacted DOC, who confirmed that the individual had self-proclaimed twice to be a gang member. The OCO informed this person that he can appeal his STG affiliation under DOC policy 470.500 to the Senior Director of Comprehensive Case Management.	Information Provided
18.	Incarcerated individual shared concerns regarding DOC not providing them with a single cell despite requiring such.	The OCO provided information regarding the single cell approval process. This office confirmed that this individual was reviewed by the Headquarters Multi-Disciplinary Team and denied. DOC staff determined that this individual did not meet the criteria for a single cell assignment.	Information Provided
19.	Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding being moved units in retaliation.	The OCO reviewed the related grievance response and confirmed that the individual was moved units due to changes to their earned release date (ERD) that resulted in them becoming ineligible for programming in their unit which necessitated the change.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
20.	Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding a use of force and wanted to ensure that the video is preserved and requested a particular officer be removed.	The OCO reviewed the records related to the use of force including video and confirmed that the video the individual requested was preserved. The OCO was unable to view the altercation that led to the use of force including the alleged staff misconduct that resulted in the individual's request to have the officer removed. Based on the lack of video showing the altercation and the documented evidence that led to the use of force, there is insufficient evidence to substantiate the individual's concern.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
21.	Incarcerated individual shared concerns regarding DOC infracting them with an infraction that no longer exist.	The OCO reviewed the complaint and found DOC actions are currently allowed within DOC policy 460.050. Following a review of DOC records, this office was able to confirm that this individual had been infracted prior to the WAC changes.	No Violation of DOC Policy
Cedar Creek Corrections Center			
22.	Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding wanting a refund for photos they paid for that have not been printed from an event.	The OCO received a phone call from the individual stating that they had received the refund and the concern was addressed.	DOC Addressed the Complaint
23.	Incarcerated individual shared concerns regarding DOC utilizing old evidence for an infraction.	The OCO reviewed the complaint and found DOC actions are currently allowed within DOC policy 460.000. Following a review of DOC records, this office was able to confirm that this individual was infracted with the aforementioned evidence following an extensive investigation. This office did confirm that this individual was not infracted previously with that evidence and the evidence had been utilized only for the related	No Violation of DOC Policy

		investigation.	
Clallam Bay Corrections Center			
24.	Person reported a flood in the unit and said that it had not been cleaned up properly. Person expressed sanitation concerns and said that the water had been in the unit for two days.	The OCO provided assistance by immediately reaching out to facility leadership upon receiving this call. After OCO outreach, facility leadership walked through the unit and substantiated that staff did not follow the proper incident reporting or biohazard clean-up protocols. Facility leadership ensured that individuals in the unit were provided with biohazard cleaning supplies, that the unit was adequately cleaned and sanitized, and that individuals were compensated for cleaning the unit. OCO staff continually followed up with facility leadership about this incident and ensured that leadership corrected the incident and communicated proper protocols to staff throughout the facility. DOC staff were able to identify that this was an isolated incident and not an issue with the facility plumbing. OCO staff visited the unit in person and talked to the individual who reported this concern and other individuals in the unit who were affected. OCO staff shared information with individuals in the unit regarding reporting any concerns to facility staff related to this incident.	Assistance Provided
25.	Person reported concern about a flooding incident in his unit.	The OCO provided assistance by immediately reaching out to facility leadership upon receiving this call. After OCO outreach, facility leadership walked through the unit and substantiated that staff did not follow the proper incident reporting or biohazard clean-up protocols. Facility leadership ensured that individuals in the unit were provided with biohazard cleaning supplies, that the unit was adequately cleaned and sanitized, and that individuals were compensated for cleaning the unit. OCO staff continually followed up with facility leadership about this incident and ensured that leadership corrected the incident and communicated proper protocols to staff throughout the facility. DOC staff were able to identify that this was an isolated incident and not an issue with the facility plumbing. OCO staff visited the unit in person and talked to the individual who reported this concern and other individuals in the unit who were affected. OCO staff shared information with individuals in the unit regarding reporting any concerns to facility staff related to this incident.	Assistance Provided
26.	Incarcerated individual reports concerns about DOC failing to protect him by housing him with close custody even though he was classified as minimum custody. He also requested access to healthcare related to injuries after being assaulted.	The OCO substantiated the assault and provided assistance by elevating the concerns to health services leadership. This office confirmed the patient was scheduled and seen for medical care including pain management following the assault. The OCO also confirmed the individual was transferred and placed in more appropriate housing for his custody level.	Assistance Provided
27.	Person reported facing a delay in receiving treatment for a wound caused by an injection complication. The person is requesting ongoing wound care and specialist consultation for surgery if necessary. The person is also requesting that the staff	DOC addressed this complaint prior to OCO action. OCO staff reviewed the person's records and found that he was seen by a specialist in the community shortly after reporting the issue to the OCO. OCO staff reviewed the recommendations made by the specialist and confirmed there was no evidence that surgery was indicated. There was insufficient evidence to substantiate the person's concern regarding the scheduling of the person's wound care appointments, however it was found that there are ongoing communication issues between Health Services and Custody staff. These communication issues have been brought to	DOC Addressed the Complaint

	behavior complaint he made be escalated through the DOC's internal process.	management at the facility level.	
28.	Incarcerated individual shared concerns regarding DOC utilizing OC near them despite their medical condition.	DOC staff addressed this concern prior to OCO action. After speaking with DOC medical staff and reviewing DOC records, this office was able to confirm that this individual has medication that is readily available to them and is informed on the process to request such.	DOC Addressed the Complaint
29.	Person reported health concerns that they believed were related to water quality.	The OCO provided information about reporting these concerns to medical if they are still occurring. OCO staff reviewed DOC records and found that this individual transferred out of the facility where they had water quality concerns and are now in a different facility. OCO staff reached out to DOC Health Services at this individual's new facility and confirmed that have been seen by medical and have not brought up these concerns at their new facility.	Information Provided
30.	Person reports having concerning symptoms after ingesting foreign objects. The person stated that he is scheduled for a specialist appointment, but he does not feel the appointment is soon enough.	The OCO provided information to the person about the delays that were substantiated in scheduling his specialist consultation. OCO staff reviewed the person's records and found that he was originally scheduled shortly after the issue was reported to the OCO. However, his appointment was rescheduled by the clinic due to there being a patient with a more urgent condition needing to see the specialist at that time. OCO staff verified the patient was able to attend the specialist appointment and recommendations were made. The OCO verified the recommended interventions have been scheduled.	Information Provided
31.	Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding placement in segregation and safety concerns.	The OCO reviewed the individual's segregation placement and spoke to DOC staff. The OCO found no violation of DOC policy 320.200 as the individual was placed in ad seg pending an investigation after an incident occurred and confirmed that their safety concerns were provided to the ad seg hearings officer.	No Violation of DOC Policy
32.	Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding placement in segregation and safety concerns.	The OCO reviewed the individual's segregation placement and spoke to DOC staff. The OCO found no violation of DOC policy 320.200 as the individual was placed in ad seg pending an investigation after an incident occurred and confirmed that their safety concerns were provided to the ad seg hearings officer.	No Violation of DOC Policy
33.	Person reported concerns about his visitation getting suspended due to an infraction. Person requested a pathway for visitation to be restored.	The OCO reviewed the complaint and found DOC actions or inactions are currently allowed within DOC policy 450.300 VII. A. which states "While the Department intends to actively engage families in support of those under its jurisdiction, visit privileges may be denied, suspended, terminated, or restricted as a sanction for a guilty finding of visit-related infractions, violent offenses, or drug-related behavior that presents a security of safety threat…2. An individual's sanction and visitor's suspension may vary in duration and the type of visitation privilege(s) loss will be related to the violation behavior (e.g., introduction of contraband during in-person visit, sexually suggestive during a video visit)." OCO staff reached out to DOC headquarters staff who provided more information about this situation.	No Violation of DOC Policy
34.	Incarcerated individual shared concerns regarding not being allowed to go up levels while on MAX custody and also shared concerns regarding wanting to utilize a specific treatment.	The OCO reviewed the complaint and found DOC actions are currently allowed within DOC policy 320.200. Following a review of DOC records, this office was able to confirm that this individual had refused specific housing due to safety concerns. DOC was unable to verify these concerns, and because of this, DOC determined that this individual would be level one while on MAX. This office also spoke with DOC medical staff and were able to verify that this individual's treatment request is being reviewed.	No Violation of DOC Policy

Coyote Ridge Corrections Center			
35.	Individual reported that he was wrongfully removed from the chemical dependency program and has been waiting in the transfer pod for over 45 days. This person also reported that he has medium custody points and that DOC should move him to a medium-custody bed.	The OCO reviewed the individual's electronic file and contacted DOC about this concern. DOC confirmed that the individual was removed from the program and will be demoted back to close custody. At this time, the person is waiting for a new custody facility plan to be created. The OCO informed the individual that he can appeal the classification decision if he disagrees with DOC's decision.	Information Provided
36.	An incarcerated individual shared concerns regarding DOC labeling them as a security threat group (STG) member when they state that they are not.	The OCO provided information regarding how the individual can appeal their STG tag. This office informed this individual that they must write to the Senior Director of Comprehensive Case Management to appeal their STG tag.	Information Provided
37.	Incarcerated individual shared concerns regarding DOC wrongly infracting them.	The OCO reviewed the complaint and found DOC actions are currently allowed within DOC policy 460.000. Following a review of DOC records, the OCO was able to confirm that this incident met the elements of the infraction.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
38.	An incarcerated individual shared concerns regarding DOC not giving them adequate access to the resolution program.	The OCO reviewed DOC records and was unable to confirm that this individual has restricted access to the resolution program. DOC records indicate that this individual has had various resolution requests go to various levels of review. This office provided this individual with information regarding circumstances the DOC resolution program will not accept resolution requests.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
39.	Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding an infraction and a use of force.	The OCO reviewed the use of force materials including video and the infraction materials and found no violation of DOC policy 460.000 for the infractions and no violation of restricted DOC policy for the use of force as a multiman fight occurred and OC spray was needed to control the situation.	No Violation of DOC Policy
40.	Incarcerated individual shared concerns regarding DOC wrongly infracting them and placing excessive sanctions on them.	The OCO reviewed the complaint and found DOC actions are currently allowed within DOC policy 460.050. Following a review of DOC records, this office was able to confirm that this individual's actions fit the criteria for the infractions given by DOC. This office also confirmed that this individual was sanctioned within the guidelines provided by DOC policy 460.050.	No Violation of DOC Policy
41.	Incarcerated individual shared concerns regarding being held in administrative segregation for an investigation.	The OCO reviewed the complaint and found DOC actions are currently allowed within DOC policy 320.200. Following a review of DOC records, this office confirmed that this individual is actively under investigation and due to this, they are being retained on Ad Seg.	No Violation of DOC Policy
42.	Incarcerated individual shared concerns regarding being infracted without proper evidence.	The OCO reviewed the complaint and found DOC actions are currently allowed within DOC policy 460.000. Following a review of DOC records, the OCO was able to confirm that this incident met the elements of the given infractions.	No Violation of DOC Policy
43.	Incarcerated individual shared concerns regarding wrongly serving multiple sanctions.	The OCO reviewed the complaint and found DOC actions are currently allowed within DOC policy 460.050. Following a review of DOC records, this office was able to confirm that this individual received sanctions that are within the guidelines for their infractions.	No Violation of DOC Policy
44.	Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding	The OCO reviewed the infraction materials and found no violation of DOC policy 460.000 as there is evidence substantiating the individual	No Violation of DOC Policy

	there not even being "some evidence" to substantiate a WAC 603.	attempted to get their visitor to bring in fentanyl which meets the “some evidence” standard utilized by DOC.	
GRE/CPA			
45.	OCO staff opened a case on behalf of an individual after it was found that their personal information was incorrectly documented where it could be seen by all staff with OMNI access.	The OCO provided assistance by contacting DOC staff and requesting removal of the personal information, which subsequently occurred.	Assistance Provided
Monroe Correctional Complex			
46.	A loved one reported concerns about an incarcerated individual receiving an infraction for having medical supplies that were prescribed to them by a doctor. They also expressed concerns about DOC staff preventing this individual from receiving required programming.	The OCO provided assistance by talking with program staff, who had other DOC staff explain the steps this individual must take to be screened for this program. The OCO reached out to DOC staff, who explained that this individual has had regular contact with the program and has not yet been found eligible, and explained what steps this individual needs to take. The OCO reviewed this individual's infraction history and could not substantiate that this individual received an infraction for the situation that was described in the complaint.	Assistance Provided
47.	A loved one reported concerns about an incarcerated individual not receiving accommodations for multiple disabilities. They expressed concerns that DOC has not documented this individual's disabilities.	The OCO provided assistance by connecting with multiple health services staff, which led to his transfer to a facility that can better accommodate him. The OCO reviewed DOC records and confirmed DOC has documented this individual's disabilities and confirmed multiple Health Status Reports (HSR) addressing his disabilities. The OCO reached out to DOC staff regarding this individual's accommodations and confirmed that he has an access assistant to help accommodate him. After OCO outreach, DOC staff worked with him regarding a plan to transfer him to a different facility which subsequently occurred.	Assistance Provided
48.	An anonymous caller reported concerns regarding housing related health status reports (HSRs) on behalf of another person who was experiencing medical complications. They requested specific HSR accommodations for this person.	DOC staff addressed this concern prior to OCO action. OCO staff reviewed the impacted person's records and found the requested HSR had been written by their medical provider.	DOC Addressed the Complaint
49.	Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding reporting they felt suicidal and swallowed an object to DOC staff, but staff did nothing.	The OCO conducted urgent outreach to DOC staff and confirmed that they were seen by both medical and mental health after these reports were made and continued to follow up with the individual's care.	Information Provided
50.	Anonymous individual relayed concerns regarding an individual living in segregation that has not showered in	The OCO spoke with DOC staff regarding this concern. DOC staff confirmed that there is an individual who has not utilized the showers in several years and instead uses the in cell water and soap to clean themselves. Staff have sent them to medical several times to check their	Information Provided

	several years.	skin to ensure the lack of showering is not impacting their health.	
51.	Person reported concerns regarding the behavior of staff in the residential treatment unit (RTU).	The OCO reviewed existing evidence and was unable to substantiate the concern. OCO staff notified facility management and requested that the person be given an opportunity to voice their concerns through the appropriate channels.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
52.	Incarcerated individual shared concerns regarding DOC not providing them with care that DOC agreed to provide them with.	This office thoroughly reviewed DOC records which included this individual's medical records. Following this review, this office was able to confirm that this individual has been seen by various specialists both within DOC's care team and at outside providers regarding their concern. This office informed this individual that the OCO has no impact on clinical decisions and encouraged them to continue working with DOC medical to take care of concerns if they arise.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
53.	An external person shared concerns on behalf of an incarcerated individual regarding not allowing them to take programming so they can release early.	The OCO reviewed the complaint and found DOC actions are currently allowed within DOC policy 570.000. Following review of DOC records, this office confirmed that this individual has not displayed behaviors that make them eligible for the programming. Due to this, they have been unable to take the programming.	No Violation of DOC Policy
54.	Incarcerated individual shared concerns regarding DOC not providing them with a lower-tier health status report.	The OCO reviewed the complaint and found DOC actions are currently allowed within the WA DOC Health Plan. This office confirmed that this individual had been assessed by a DOC clinician and it was not recommended that they receive the lower-tier health status report. This office informed this individual that the OCO has no impact on DOC clinical decisions and encouraged them to continue working with DOC medical staff to take care of any issues that may arise.	No Violation of DOC Policy
55.	Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding an infraction and who was present during the infraction hearing.	The OCO reviewed the infraction materials and found no violation of DOC policy 460.000 as the concerns the individual raised on appeal regarding DOC number and cell location varying are minor administrative errors that are not grounds for an infraction dismissal. Regarding a custody officer being present during the hearing, DOC policy 460.000(IV)(E) does not state anything about presence of third parties.	No Violation of DOC Policy
56.	Incarcerated individual shared concerns regarding their treatment plan and being infracted for making a mental health care request.	The OCO reviewed DOC records and was able to confirm that this individual was not infracted for a mental health care request, and instead was infracted due to their actions towards staff. Due to these actions, this individual was infracted per DOC policy 460.000. This office also confirmed that this individual has been assessed regarding their treatment concern but disagree with the treatment. This office provided this individual with information regarding options this individual can utilize to potentially obtain the treatment they seek.	No Violation of DOC Policy
57.	Incarcerated individual shared concerns regarding being suspended from the resolution program.	The OCO reviewed the complaint and found DOC actions are currently allowed within DOC policy 550.100 and the Resolution Program Manual (RPM). Following a review of DOC records, this office was able to confirm that this individual has violated the rules set regarding the resolution program numerous times. Due to this, their access to the program has been suspended. This office encouraged this individual to follow the guidelines of the RPM and DOC policy 550.100 or their access will continue to be restricted.	No Violation of DOC Policy
Olympic Corrections Center			
58.	A person reported concerns regarding an inappropriate relationship occurring at his facility. The person requested	The OCO reviewed existing evidence and was unable to substantiate the concern. The person did not provide sufficient information to pursue an investigation.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate

	an external investigation but did not provide any names or additional information.		
59.	A loved one reported concerns about the medical treatment that an incarcerated individual is receiving for an injury.	The OCO reviewed the complaint and found DOC actions or inactions are currently allowed within DOC policy 600.000 and the WA DOC Health Plan. OCO staff reviewed DOC records, including appointment records and resolutions requests. The OCO found that his provider and medical specialists did not agree with the medical interventions requested by the patient. The OCO verified that this individual met with his provider, consulted with a specialist, had tests, and received a treatment plan. The OCO cannot impact treatment decisions made by medical providers that are supported by the DOC Health Plan and DOC Policy.	No Violation of DOC Policy
Reentry Center - Longview - Cowlitz			
60.	Incarcerated individual shared concerns regarding DOC targeting them.	The OCO reviewed DOC records and was unable to confirm that DOC staff are targeting this individual. To substantiate retaliation, the OCO must be able to prove that a negative action from a DOC staff member is not only linked close in time to an incarcerated individual's protected action but there must be evidence of a clear relationship between the two acts.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
Reentry Center - Tacoma - Pierce			
61.	A loved one reported concerns related to facility management, policy enforcement, and a lack of transparency, which they believe violates Department of Corrections policies and Washington Administrative Code (WAC) regulations.	The OCO opened an investigation regarding these concerns and brought said concerns to DOC leadership. In response, DOC created multiple corrective action plans to address concerns raised by the OCO.	Assistance Provided
62.	Individual reported many concerns regarding the Tacoma Reentry Center (TRC), including DOC staff opening OCO mail without the incarcerated individual present, not following the visitation guidelines that are outlined in the statewide reentry center handbook, property concerns, and a lack of reentry-focused resources for individuals reentering the community.	The OCO followed up on this concern and the facility agreed to update their visitation rules to match the Statewide Reentry Center Handbook and treat OCO mail as legal mail. The OCO confirmed that DOC created multiple corrective action plans to address concerns raised by the OCO.	Assistance Provided
63.	Individual reported that staff are harassing him, being rude, and forcing him to go to WorkSource when he has a job.	The OCO investigated this concern, along with several others, and reported these issues to DOC leadership. In response to the issues raised by the OCO, the facility developed numerous corrective action plans to address them. The OCO also provided this person with information about how to send his resolution request directly to DOC headquarters from the reentry center using the pre-stamped envelopes.	Information Provided
Stafford Creek Corrections Center			
64.	A loved one reported that a family member died, and her husband applied for a	The OCO provided assistance by reviewing the individual's records and contacting DOC about this concern. DOC confirmed that the furlough was denied due to DOC's safety and security concerns. The OCO visited the	Assistance Provided

	furlough but has not received a response from DOC. The person reported that her incarcerated loved one followed the process, and the packet has been sitting with leadership for several days.	facility and conducted a follow-up visit with the individual regarding this case.	
65.	Incarcerated individual shared concerns regarding DOC not providing them with protective custody.	The OCO provided information regarding how to request protective custody. This office reviewed DOC records and confirmed that DOC staff determined that there were no validated protective concerns for this individual. This office also confirmed that this individual was moved to a different facility per their request following a new custody facility plan.	Information Provided
66.	Person reported concerns about a lack of follow up for some testing he had done prior to incarceration. The person is requesting to see a specialist and get a second opinion from a non-DOC medical provider.	The OCO provided information to the person about his specialist consultation request. OCO staff reviewed the person's records and found that he was seen by his primary care provider and received the results of the imaging. OCO staff also found that the person's medical provider agreed that he should see a specialist, however he is too close to release to establish care with a specialist in the community in that location due to scheduling wait times of the outside clinics. OCO staff verified the person does not have a release plan. This makes establishing continuity of care between incarceration and release impossible until it is known what county the person will be releasing too. Once the release plan is made, the reentry nurse is responsible for finding what care can be planned before release.	Information Provided
67.	Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding being on conditions of confinement (COCs) that are preventing them from having their phone book, pens, paper, magazines, radio and TV.	The OCO requested all COCs for the related time period. The only responsive record indicated that the individual was on COCs one time and the only restriction was "no sharps". As a result, there is insufficient evidence to show the individual was restricted from the items they state.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
68.	Incarcerated individual shared concerns regarding DOC not placing them in a safe harbor.	The OCO reviewed the complaint and found DOC actions are currently allowed within DOC policy 470.150. This office confirmed that this individual was provided with the opportunity to share their safety concerns with DOC staff. These concerns were investigated and determined to be unsubstantiated. This office provided this individual with information regarding the requirement to potentially obtain safe harbor placement.	No Violation of DOC Policy
69.	Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding the denial of extended family visits (EFVs).	The OCO reviewed the denial and appeal and found no violation of DOC policy 590.100 as there is both domestic violence history and concerns about messages being sent between the individual and their visitor.	No Violation of DOC Policy
70.	A loved one reported concerns about Extended Family Visits (EFV) with an incarcerated individual being denied.	The OCO reviewed the complaint and found DOC actions or inactions are currently allowed within DOC policy 590.100 and 590.100 attachment 1. The OCO reviewed DOC records regarding this EFV denial, including the appeal and the response to the appeal, and found that DOC was within policy to deny the EFV.	No Violation of DOC Policy
Washington Corrections Center			
71.	Person reported concerns about back pain and described barriers with seeing his provider.	The OCO provided assistance by working with DOC staff to get this individual scheduled with his provider and with a specialist. The OCO reviewed DOC records regarding his medical concerns and reached out to DOC staff, who scheduled him with his provider after OCO outreach. The	Assistance Provided

		OCO confirmed that this individual was then seen by his provider and they had begun trialing pain management medications. During records review, OCO staff found a specialist consult from earlier in the year was never scheduled. After, DOC staff worked to ensure these specialist appointments were scheduled, which the OCO confirmed in DOC records.	
72.	Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding their placement.	The OCO reviewed this concern and confirmed that they have been moved to their desired location.	DOC Addressed the Complaint
73.	Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding their wife being suspended from visitation.	The OCO reviewed the individual's approved visitors and confirmed that visits with their wife were reinstated.	DOC Addressed the Complaint
74.	Incarcerated individual shared concerns regarding DOC infracting them wrongly.	DOC staff addressed this concern prior to OCO action. Following a review of DOC records, this office was able to confirm that DOC dismissed the infraction following the hearing.	DOC Addressed the Complaint
75.	Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding their placement.	The OCO reviewed this concern and confirmed that they have been moved to their desired location.	DOC Addressed the Complaint
76.	Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding infraction sanctions.	The individual contacted the OCO and stated that this case could be closed as DOC reduced the infraction from a WAC 603 to a 667 and the sanctions were corrected.	DOC Addressed the Complaint
77.	Family member reported concerns about the unit flooding repeatedly.	The OCO monitored this situation for several weeks, had ongoing conversations with DOC about the flooding and visited the facility to confirm it was properly addressed. The OCO confirmed that individuals were flushing objects such as fishing line down the toilet repeatedly which resulted in extreme damage to the pipes causing flooding. The facility is doing what they can to mitigate the issue including having hazmat porters clean the unit as needed, however, due to the damage to the pipes, a larger construction project is now required.	Information Provided
78.	Family member reported concerns about the unit flooding repeatedly.	The OCO monitored this situation for several weeks, had ongoing conversations with DOC about the flooding and visited the facility to confirm it was properly addressed. The OCO confirmed that individuals were flushing objects such as fishing line down the toilet repeatedly which resulted in extreme damage to the pipes causing flooding. The facility is doing what they can to mitigate the issue including having hazmat porters clean the unit as needed, however, due to the damage to the pipes, a larger construction project is now required.	Information Provided
79.	Family member reported concerns about the unit flooding repeatedly.	The OCO monitored this situation for several weeks, had ongoing conversations with DOC about the flooding and visited the facility to confirm it was properly addressed. The OCO confirmed that individuals were flushing objects such as fishing line down the toilet repeatedly which resulted in extreme damage to the pipes causing flooding. The facility is doing what they can to mitigate the issue including having hazmat porters clean the unit as needed, however, due to the damage to the pipes, a larger construction project is now required.	Information Provided
80.	Family member reported concerns about the unit flooding repeatedly.	The OCO monitored this situation for several weeks, had ongoing conversations with DOC about the flooding and visited the facility to confirm it was properly addressed. The OCO confirmed that individuals	Information Provided

		were flushing objects such as fishing line down the toilet repeatedly which resulted in extreme damage to the pipes causing flooding. The facility is doing what they can to mitigate the issue including having hazmat porters clean the unit as needed, however, due to the damage to the pipes, a larger construction project is now required.	
81.	Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding wanting to work with OCO on systemic concerns related to legislative access for incarcerated people and an infraction.	The OCO previously reviewed the infraction and thus did not re-review this portion of the concern. The OCO is currently exploring waays to work with incarcerated individuals on systemic concerns such as policy comments in the future. The OCO invites individuals to send any policy ideas to the OCO or to submit policy comments themselves directly to DOC headquarters.	Information Provided
82.	Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding having a single cell assignment taken away.	The OCO reviewed the individual's single cell screening and spoke with DOC headquarters. The OCO found that the individual is currently not approved for a single cell through the headquarters level screening due to it not being necessary. As a result, if the facility gave them a single cell, it would not be an official headquarters level approval and the facility can remove it as needed. As the individual is not approved for a single cell through the official headquarters screening, the OCO informed them that they can work with medical to get an HSR for a single cell if it is determined to be medically necessary.	Information Provided
83.	Incarcerated individual relayed concerns about their placement.	The OCO monitored the progression of the individual's custody facility plan (CFP) and confirmed that were transferred to the facility they requested.	Information Provided
84.	Incarcerated individual shared concerns regarding DOC not protecting them despite being informed they would be protected after sharing information.	The OCO reviewed existing evidence and was unable to substantiate the concern. DOC records indicate that this individual was noted as having valid safety concerns and was housed in an area where their safety could be ensured. This individual is actively pending transfer to a facility they will be safe at.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
85.	Incarcerated individual shared concerns regarding the lack of medical care for their concern.	This office spoke with DOC staff and reviewed DOC records. Following this, the OCO was able to confirm that this individual has been seen various times regarding their concern. DOC medical staff shared that this individual has future care currently being scheduled out.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
86.	Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding an infraction for items they state were their cellmate's.	The OCO reviewed the infraction materials and found there to be insufficient evidence to substantiate their version of the events as the infraction narrative states that the individual claimed possession of the items found on their cellmate.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
87.	An external person shared concerns regarding DOC inappropriately placing them in safe harbor.	The OCO reviewed the complaint and found DOC actions are currently allowed within DOC policy 320.180. Following a review of DOC records, this office was able to confirm that this individual had been housed in safe harbor due to their verified need for safe housing. Records indicated that this individual then denied placement in that setting, and due to their lack of placement options, this individual was moved to a setting they will be safe.	No Violation of DOC Policy
88.	Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding an infraction and not being given a staff advisor.	The OCO reviewed the infraction materials and found no violation of DOC policy 460.000 as there was evidence to substantiate the infraction. A hearing advisor is only given if an individual cannot understand the nature of offense. It was determined that the individual could understand the proceedings and a hearing advisor was not needed.	No Violation of DOC Policy
Washington Corrections Center for Women			
89.	An individual reported they	The OCO reviewed the incident and contacted DOC about this concern.	DOC

	were found guilty of a staff assault and multiple other infractions for dropping shampoo bottles.	After a second review of the individual's records, the OCO confirmed that the Department reduced her staff assault infraction.	Addressed the Complaint
90.	Person reported concerns about her treatment plan not moving forward after an unsuccessful medication trial. The person is requesting that DOC do more to find out what is going on with her health and provide a new treatment plan.	DOC addressed the complaint prior to OCO action. OCO staff reviewed the person's concern and found that she was already scheduled for additional diagnostics. OCO staff monitored this appointment to ensure the person was able to attend and that recommendations for follow up were carried out by DOC. OCO staff verified the person is scheduled to see a specialist for the reported concern.	DOC Addressed the Complaint
91.	Incarcerated individual shared concerns regarding DOC changing their medication.	DOC staff addressed this concern prior to OCO action. After speaking with DOC staff, this office was able to confirm that this individual has been switched back to their desired medication following ongoing discussions with their provider.	DOC Addressed the Complaint
92.	Formerly incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding a PREA that occurred while they were incarcerated.	The OCO reviewed the individual's record and could not find any indication of a PREA with the people the individual named.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
Washington State Penitentiary			
93.	An external person shared concerns on behalf of an incarcerated individual regarding DOC medical not seeing them despite constant outreach.	DOC staff addressed this concern prior to OCO action. Following a review of DOC records, this office was able to confirm that this individual was seen by DOC medical staff regarding their concern.	DOC Addressed the Complaint
94.	Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding placement in segregation.	The OCO reviewed the individual's placement and confirmed that they were released from segregation.	DOC Addressed the Complaint
95.	Person reported delays in getting seen by medical for a condition they developed prior to incarceration. The person reported that they had imaging done in the community and having issues getting DOC to retrieve those records so that he could receive a treatment plan. The person is requesting that DOC provide a new scan rather than continuing to track down old records.	DOC addressed this concern prior to OCO action. OCO staff reviewed the person's records and found that he was able to receive the requested scan a week after reporting the issue to the OCO.	DOC Addressed the Complaint
96.	Incarcerated individual shared concerns regarding wanting to go to minimum custody.	DOC staff addressed this concern prior to OCO action. Following a review of DOC records, this office was able to confirm that this individual has been promoted and moved to a minimum custody facility.	DOC Addressed the Complaint
97.	Anonymous individual	The OCO is in ongoing conversations with DOC regarding the	Information

	reported concerns about the lack of showers that occur while the unit is on GVRS.	implementation of GVRS and various concerns surrounding it.	Provided
98.	Patient reported concerns about not receiving medical follow up after antibiotic treatment and ongoing pneumonia symptoms.	The OCO elevated the concerns to health services leadership and confirmed the patient was seen for follow up and treatment updates. The patient reported a new concern and transferred to another facility. This office opened a new case about his updated medical concerns.	Information Provided
99.	Patient reported urgent medical needs related to wound care and a wheelchair. The individual requested that OCO call the facility Superintendent on his behalf.	The OCO elevated the concerns through facility health services leadership and provided the patient with information. After outreach, DOC agreed to work with the resolution specialist to further address the patient's concerns. This office confirmed the patient was provided wound care appointments and an alternative wheelchair for use until the new items are ordered and arrive.	Information Provided
100.	Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding getting a WAC 603 that occurred after the WAC changes had been implemented.	The OCO reviewed the infraction materials and confirmed that the infraction incident occurred prior to the WAC changes thus the infraction was properly written and upheld as a WAC 603 as any changes to 603s are based on the date of the incident and are being retroactively reviewed only if they occurred between January 28-June 24, 2026.	Information Provided
101.	Person reported concerns about incorrect calculation of his earned time.	The OCO reviewed DOC records and found that this concern is still under review by the Resolutions process. The OCO encouraged this individual to continue working with Resolutions and to request a time audit from the Records department.	Information Provided
102.	Person reported concerns about access to the Medication Assisted Treatment (MAT) Program.	The OCO provided information about what steps this individual needs to take to get screened for the MAT program. The OCO reviewed DOC records regarding this concern and provided information specific to his situation.	Information Provided
103.	Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding feeling suicidal and wanting to move out of their current unit.	The OCO made urgent outreach to the facility and reviewed their placement. The OCO confirmed the individual was given prompt mental health attention regarding the suicidal ideations. Regarding placement, the individual is housed in the BAR units for RTU care. As RTU placement is a clinical decision, the OCO cannot override clinical decisions per DOC policy 600.000. The other RTU placement option is the Sky River Treatment Center (SRTC) at Monroe but informed the individual there may be difficulties being accepted for a transfer there due to their recent infraction history.	Information Provided
104.	Incarcerated individual shared concerns regarding DOC blocking them from submitting their legal documents.	The OCO reviewed DOC records and was unable to confirm that this individual's legal access has been blocked. Records indicate that this individual has submitted DOC forms that request legal service and those requests have been fulfilled.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
105.	Person reported that he was not allowed to attend this year's Passover event because staff did not put a deadline notice in the unit for sign-up.	The OCO reviewed existing evidence and was unable to substantiate the concern. The OCO reviewed DOC records and reached out to DOC staff, who explained the process for individuals in the Intensive Management Unit (IMU) to sign up for Passover. They stated that the sign-up is available for six weeks and occurs months before Passover begins. DOC records showed that other individuals in this individual's unit were able to sign-up for and attend Passover.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate

106.	Incarcerated individual shared concerns regarding DOC not following a court order.	This office reviewed DOC records and were unable to confirm that this individual has the specific court order they mentioned. This office encouraged this individual to reach out to their county of conviction to obtain a copy of the order they are mentioning.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
107.	Incarcerated individual shared concerns regarding DOC not providing them with protective custody.	The OCO reviewed the complaint and found DOC actions are currently allowed within DOC policy 320.180. Following a review of DOC records, this office was able to confirm that this individual was reviewed for protective custody but denied. This office provided this individual with information regarding how they can potentially obtain protective custody in the future. This office was also able to confirm that this individual was moved to a location they are safe at.	No Violation of DOC Policy
108.	Incarcerated individual shared concerns regarding DOC infracting them for something that was not their fault.	The OCO reviewed the complaint and found DOC actions are currently allowed within DOC policy 460.000. Following a review of DOC records, this office was able to confirm that the circumstances of the incident fit the criteria for the infraction.	No Violation of DOC Policy
109.	Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding their sister being removed from their visiting list.	The OCO reviewed the visitation denial and found no violation of DOC policy 450.300 as victims of an incarcerated individual of the current offense they are incarcerated for or any other adjudicated offense are not allowed to visit. Because this situation applies to this individual and their visitor, the visits are not allowed per policy.	No Violation of DOC Policy
110.	Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding their fiancée's visits being terminated.	The OCO reviewed the visitation termination and spoke to DOC staff about this. The OCO found no violation of DOC policy 450.300 as there have been several visitation violations including wearing an Apple Watch during visitation processing, various policy violations including having multiple e-message accounts as well as evidence of involvement with contraband introduction.	No Violation of DOC Policy
	Intake Investigations		
	Airway Heights Corrections Center		
111.	A friend or family member reported a concern to this office regarding this person's pending transfer and facility placement.	The incarcerated individual did not respond to the OCO's request for permission to investigate and/or additional information within 30 days. The OCO encouraged the incarcerated person to contact the OCO via mail or hotline if they would like to request assistance.	Complaint Withdrawn
112.	Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding being overcharged for mail and packages.	The OCO declined to move the complaint beyond the intake investigation phase per WAC 138-10-040(3)(g) as at this time the OCO is unable to investigate complaints addressing mail and property due to extremely limited resources.	Declined
113.	Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding their tablet being taken away.	The OCO declined to move the complaint beyond the intake investigation phase per WAC 138-10-040(3)(g) as at this time the OCO is unable to investigate complaints addressing tablets due to extremely limited resources.	Declined
114.	Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding others getting hired before them to become a custodian.	The OCO declined to move the complaint beyond the intake investigation phase per WAC 138-10-040(3)(g) as at this time the OCO is unable to investigate complaints addressing jobs due to extremely limited resources.	Declined
115.	A friend or family member of an incarcerated person reported a concern related to damaged property and an infraction.	Prior to OCO involvement, the incarcerated person has options for resolving the concern through a DOC appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. If the individual's concern is not addressed by these DOC processes, they can then contact the OCO for assistance. The OCO provided technical assistance about how to file a tort claim and appeal infractions.	Technical Assistance Provided

116.	A friend or family member reported a concern related to the classification and housing assignment of an incarcerated person.	Prior to OCO involvement, the incarcerated person has options for resolving the concern through a DOC appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. If the individual's concern is not addressed by these DOC processes, they can then contact the OCO for assistance. The OCO verified that the incarcerated person has not provided any information regarding their current safety concerns to DOC. The OCO also provided technical assistance about how to appeal custody facility plans and report safety concerns to DOC.	Technical Assistance Provided
117.	A friend or family member reported a concern related to the classification and housing assignment of an incarcerated person.	Prior to OCO involvement, the incarcerated person has options for resolving the concern through a DOC appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. If the individual's concern is not addressed by these DOC processes, they can then contact the OCO for assistance. The OCO verified that the incarcerated person has not provided any information regarding their current safety concerns to DOC. The OCO also provided technical assistance about how to appeal custody facility plans and report safety concerns to DOC.	Technical Assistance Provided
118.	A family member of an incarcerated person reported a concern related to the behavior of a DOC staff member, an infraction, and missing property.	Prior to OCO involvement, the incarcerated person has options for resolving the concern through a DOC appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. If the individual's concern is not addressed by these DOC processes, they can then contact the OCO for assistance. The OCO provided technical assistance about how to file a staff behavior complaint, the infraction process and how to file a tort claim for missing property.	Technical Assistance Provided
119.	A family member of an incarcerated person reported a concern related to the behavior of a DOC staff member, an infraction, and missing property.	Prior to OCO involvement, the incarcerated person has options for resolving the concern through a DOC appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. If the individual's concern is not addressed by these DOC processes, they can then contact the OCO for assistance. The OCO provided technical assistance about how to file a staff behavior complaint, the infraction process and how to file a tort claim for missing property.	Technical Assistance Provided
120.	Incarcerated individual shared concerns regarding DOC not providing them with their desired care.	Prior to OCO involvement, the incarcerated person has options for resolving the concern through a DOC appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. If the individual's concern is not addressed by these DOC processes, they can then contact the OCO for assistance. The OCO provided technical assistance about filing resolution requests and how to request specific treatments.	Technical Assistance Provided
121.	An incarcerated person requested the contact information for the DOC contract attorney.	Prior to OCO involvement, the incarcerated person has options for resolving the concern through a DOC appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. If the individual's concern is not addressed by these DOC processes, they can then contact the OCO for assistance. The OCO provided technical assistance about how to ask DOC staff for the contract attorney's contact information and general law library information. The OCO does not have access to the DOC contract attorney's contact information.	Technical Assistance Provided
122.	An incarcerated person reported a concern related to the behavior of DOC staff members and requested legal assistance.	Prior to OCO involvement, the incarcerated person has options for resolving the concern through a DOC appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. If the individual's concern is not addressed by these DOC processes, they can then contact the OCO for assistance. The OCO provided technical assistance about how to report staff behavior and provided publicly available information regarding legal access options in DOC.	Technical Assistance Provided
123.	An incarcerated person reported a concern related to	Prior to OCO involvement, the incarcerated person has options for resolving the concern through a DOC appeals process or the DOC	Technical Assistance

	the behavior of a DOC staff member.	Resolution Program. If the individual's concern is not addressed by these DOC processes, they can then contact the OCO for assistance. The OCO provided technical assistance about appealing the reported DOC staff behavior through the DOC Resolution Program to level 2 prior to reaching out to the OCO.	Provided
124.	An incarcerated person reported a concern related to DOC losing IDs that were received by DOC and supposed to be held in his central file.	Prior to OCO involvement, the incarcerated person has options for resolving the concern through a DOC appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. If the individual's concern is not addressed by these DOC processes, they can then contact the OCO for assistance. The OCO provided technical assistance about how to file a tort claim.	Technical Assistance Provided
125.	An incarcerated person reported an issue with the calculation of their time served.	Prior to OCO involvement, the incarcerated person has options for resolving the concern through a DOC appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. If the individual's concern is not addressed by these DOC processes, they can then contact the OCO for assistance. The OCO provided technical assistance about resolution requests related to time calculation and OCO limitations.	Technical Assistance Provided
126.	An incarcerated person reported a concern related to the behavior of a DOC staff member while out on work crew.	Prior to OCO involvement, the incarcerated person has options for resolving the concern through a DOC appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. If the individual's concern is not addressed by these DOC processes, they can then contact the OCO for assistance. The OCO provided technical assistance about reporting DOC staff behavior through the DOC Resolution Program prior to reaching out to the OCO.	Technical Assistance Provided
127.	An incarcerated person reported a concern related to their sentence not showing correctly in OMNI.	Prior to OCO involvement, the incarcerated person has options for resolving the concern through a DOC appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. If the individual's concern is not addressed by these DOC processes, they can then contact the OCO for assistance. The OCO provided technical assistance about appealing the Resolution Request they have filed up to level 3.	Technical Assistance Provided
128.	An incarcerated person reported a concern related to a miscalculation of their sentence.	Prior to OCO involvement, the incarcerated person has options for resolving the concern through a DOC appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. If the individual's concern is not addressed by these DOC processes, they can then contact the OCO for assistance. The OCO provided technical assistance about how to use the Resolution Program to request DOC records recalculate their time and some information on how to contact legal resources.	Technical Assistance Provided
Clallam Bay Corrections Center			
129.	A friend or family member reported a concern to this office regarding a restriction being placed on their Securus Technologies account preventing communication with this person and other individuals.	The incarcerated individual did not respond to the OCO's request for permission to investigate and/or additional information within 30 days. The OCO encouraged the incarcerated person to contact the OCO via mail or hotline if they would like to request assistance.	Complaint Withdrawn
130.	A friend or family member reported a concern to this office regarding this person's ability to access mental health services.	The incarcerated individual did not respond to the OCO's request for permission to investigate and/or additional information within 30 days. The OCO encouraged the incarcerated person to contact the OCO via mail or hotline if they would like to request assistance.	Complaint Withdrawn
131.	An incarcerated person called to report a concern. Intake	OCO staff opened this case in error.	Complaint Withdrawn

	was incomplete due to a technical issue. The incarcerated person called back and the concern was recorded in a different case.		
132.	A community member relayed concerns regarding an incarcerated individual sharing their phone number with other incarcerated individuals and wanting the individual's phone privileges taken away.	The OCO declined to investigate the concern per WAC 138-10-040(3)(e) as the requested resolution is not within the ombuds' statutory power and authority.	No Jurisdiction
133.	Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding wanting assistance pressing charges against someone who attacked them.	The OCO declined to investigate the concern per WAC 138-10-040(3)(e) as the requested resolution is not within the ombuds' statutory power and authority.	No Jurisdiction
134.	Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding having to register as a sex offender for a conviction that is not on their record.	The OCO declined to investigate the concern per WAC 138-10-040(3)(a) as the ombuds does not have jurisdiction over the complaint as the complaint relates to an action taken by an agency other than the Washington State Department of Corrections (WADOC) such as sentencing matters.	No Jurisdiction
135.	An incarcerated person reported a concern related to safety concerns.	Prior to OCO involvement, the incarcerated person has options for resolving the concern through a DOC appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. If the individual's concern is not addressed by these DOC processes, they can then contact the OCO for assistance. The OCO provided technical assistance about how to appeal custody facility plans and report safety concerns to DOC.	Technical Assistance Provided
136.	Person reported issues with the attitude and behavior of staff on his unit. The person stated that he had not yet filed a resolution request at the time of reporting his concern.	Prior to OCO involvement, the incarcerated person has options for resolving the concern through a DOC appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. If the individual's concern is not addressed by these DOC processes, they can then contact the OCO for assistance. The OCO provided technical assistance about filing staff conduct complaints through DOC.	Technical Assistance Provided
137.	An incarcerated person reported an old injury caused by DOC action and requested financial compensation.	Prior to OCO involvement, the incarcerated person has options for resolving the concern through a DOC appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. If the individual's concern is not addressed by these DOC processes, they can then contact the OCO for assistance. The OCO provided technical assistance about how to file a tort claim.	Technical Assistance Provided
Coyote Ridge Corrections Center			
138.	A friend or family member reported a concern to this office regarding this person receiving a negative behavior observation entry (BOE) and a broader issue relating to DOC employee training and policy comprehension.	The incarcerated individual did not respond to the OCO's request for permission to investigate and/or additional information within 30 days. The OCO encouraged the incarcerated person to contact the OCO via mail or hotline if they would like to request assistance.	Complaint Withdrawn
139.	The individual asked the OCO to review his case regarding	Per WAC 138-10-040(3)(f), the OCO declined to investigate the complaint beyond intake	Declined

	an infraction that was given a re-hearing.	as the individual released from DOC custody prior to the OCO investigating the concern.	
140.	Loved one relayed concerns regarding the prison not informing her that her husband would be unable to call her that day.	The OCO declined to investigate the concern per WAC 138-10-040(3)(d) as the complaint does not allege a violation of policy, procedure or law.	Declined
141.	Person reported a concern regarding a mail rejection he received that he believed violated DOC policy.	Per WAC 138-10-040(3), the OCO declined to investigate the complaint beyond intake because the complaint did not allege violation of policy, procedure, or law.	Declined
142.	External person reported concerns regarding their loved one being punished after expressing housing related safety concerns. The external person is requesting that their loved one be moved back to the previous facility where they felt safe.	Prior to OCO involvement, the incarcerated person has options for resolving the concern through a DOC appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. If the individual's concern is not addressed by these DOC processes, they can then contact the OCO for assistance. The OCO provided technical assistance about appealing infractions.	Technical Assistance Provided
143.	An incarcerated person reported a concern related to a visitation denial.	Prior to OCO involvement, the incarcerated person has options for resolving the concern through a DOC appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. If the individual's concern is not addressed by these DOC processes, they can then contact the OCO for assistance. The OCO provided technical assistance about how to appeal visitation denials.	Technical Assistance Provided
144.	Person reported concerns regarding their access to the MAT program. The person stated they have been diagnosed with Opioid Use Disorder (OUD) but DOC refuses to provide medication for it.	Prior to OCO involvement, the incarcerated person has options for resolving the concern through a DOC appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. If the individual's concern is not addressed by these DOC processes, they can then contact the OCO for assistance. The OCO provided technical assistance about the DOC's protocol for ordering Medications for Opioid Use Disorder.	Technical Assistance Provided
Monroe Correctional Complex			
145.	External person reported that their loved one is not being provided with the ADA accommodations necessary for his medical condition.	This case was a duplicate of one that already existed from the same complainant and for the same concern.	Complaint Withdrawn
146.	External person reported that their loved one is not being provided with the ADA accommodations necessary for his medical condition.	This case was a duplicate of one that already existed from the same complainant and for the same concern.	Complaint Withdrawn
147.	A friend or family member reported a concern regarding their loved one not being able to access MAT/MOUD treatment.	The incarcerated individual did not respond to the OCO's request for permission to investigate and/or additional information within 30 days. The OCO encouraged the incarcerated person to contact the OCO via mail or hotline if they would like to request assistance.	Complaint Withdrawn
148.	A friend or family member reported concerns regarding a serious infraction their loved	The incarcerated individual did not respond to the OCO's request for permission to investigate and/or additional information within 30 days. The OCO encouraged the incarcerated person to contact the OCO via mail	Complaint Withdrawn

	one received, causing termination from the program they were enrolled in, and a subsequent serious infraction for the termination.	or hotline if they would like to request assistance.	
149.	Incarcerated individual sent the OCO a copy of a data breach notification they were given by DOC with no additional context.	The OCO declined to investigate the concern per WAC 138-10-040(3)(g) any other reasons the ombuds deems relevant to the complaint, including, but not limited to, the priority and weight given to these and other relevant factors.	Declined
150.	Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding receiving general infractions.	The OCO declined to move the complaint beyond the intake investigation phase per WAC 138-10-040(3)(g) as at this time the OCO is unable to investigate complaints addressing general infractions due to extremely limited resources.	Declined
151.	Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding wanting information on a tort claim they filed.	The OCO declined to investigate the concern per WAC 138-10-040(3)(a) as the ombuds does not have jurisdiction over the complaint as the complaint relates to an action taken by an agency other than the Washington State Department of Corrections (WADOC).	No Jurisdiction
152.	An incarcerated person reported a concern related to the behavior of a DOC staff member while out on work crew.	Prior to OCO involvement, the incarcerated person has options for resolving the concern through a DOC appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. If the individual's concern is not addressed by these DOC processes, they can then contact the OCO for assistance. The OCO provided technical assistance about reporting DOC staff behavior through the DOC Resolution Program prior to reaching out to the OCO.	Technical Assistance Provided
153.	A friend or family member of an incarcerated person reported a concern related to the behavior of a DOC staff member and a general infraction.	Prior to OCO involvement, the incarcerated person has options for resolving the concern through a DOC appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. If the individual's concern is not addressed by these DOC processes, they can then contact the OCO for assistance. The OCO provided technical assistance about reporting staff behavior and appealing infractions.	Technical Assistance Provided
154.	An incarcerated person reported a concern related to a visitation denial.	Prior to OCO involvement, the incarcerated person has options for resolving the concern through a DOC appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. If the individual's concern is not addressed by these DOC processes, they can then contact the OCO for assistance. The OCO provided technical assistance about how to appeal visitation denials.	Technical Assistance Provided
155.	An incarcerated person reported a concern related to a miscalculation of their sentence.	Prior to OCO involvement, the incarcerated person has options for resolving the concern through a DOC appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. If the individual's concern is not addressed by these DOC processes, they can then contact the OCO for assistance. The OCO provided technical assistance about how to use the Resolution Program to request DOC records recalculate their time and some information on how to contact legal resources.	Technical Assistance Provided
156.	Person reported that another incarcerated person is living in unsanitary conditions and it is affecting the whole unit.	Prior to OCO involvement, the incarcerated person has options for resolving the concern through a DOC appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. If the individual's concern is not addressed by these DOC processes, they can then contact the OCO for assistance. The OCO provided technical assistance about filing a resolution request.	Technical Assistance Provided

157.	An incarcerated person reported an issue related to possible retaliation behavior by a DOC staff member.	Prior to OCO involvement, the incarcerated person has options for resolving the concern through a DOC appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. If the individual's concern is not addressed by these DOC processes, they can then contact the OCO for assistance. The OCO provided technical assistance about appealing the infraction received and information about retaliation.	Technical Assistance Provided
Olympic Corrections Center			
158.	A friend or family member reported a concern related to an incarcerated person not receiving pay for hours that they worked.	Prior to OCO involvement, the incarcerated person has options for resolving the concern through a DOC appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. If the individual's concern is not addressed by these DOC processes, they can then contact the OCO for assistance. The OCO provided technical assistance about how to report the concern as both a DOC staff behavior concern and banking concern so banking can review their pay and verify it is being done correctly.	Technical Assistance Provided
Other			
159.	Individual relayed concerns regarding the conduct of a community corrections officer.	This case is a duplicate of one that already exists in the OCO case management system.	Complaint Withdrawn
160.	Family member relayed concerns regarding their loved one's community corrections office reporting false absconding.	The OCO declined to investigate the concern per WAC 138-10-040(3)(a) as the ombuds does not have jurisdiction over the complaint as the complaint relates to an action taken by an agency other than the Washington State Department of Corrections (WADOC) or occurred while an individual was not in full or partial confinement of a Washington State Department of Corrections prison, such as jails.	No Jurisdiction
161.	Family member relayed concerns regarding the grievances their loved one files not being recorded in addition to improper food being served at the jail.	The OCO declined to investigate the concern per WAC 138-10-040(3)(a) as the ombuds does not have jurisdiction over the complaint as the complaint relates to an action taken by an agency other than the Washington State Department of Corrections (WADOC) or occurred while an individual was not in full or partial confinement of a Washington State Department of Corrections prison, such as jails.	No Jurisdiction
162.	Loved one relayed concerns regarding the jail serving their brother improper food.	The OCO declined to investigate the concern per WAC 138-10-040(3)(a) as the ombuds does not have jurisdiction over the complaint as the complaint relates to an action taken by an agency other than the Washington State Department of Corrections (WADOC) or occurred while an individual was not in full or partial confinement of a Washington State Department of Corrections prison, such as jails.	No Jurisdiction
163.	Family member relayed concerns regarding unlawful detention of their loved one at Spokane County Detention Center.	The OCO declined to investigate the concern per WAC 138-10-040(3)(a) as the ombuds does not have jurisdiction over the complaint as the complaint relates to an action taken by an agency other than the Washington State Department of Corrections (WADOC) or occurred while an individual was not in full or partial confinement of a Washington State Department of Corrections prison, such as jails.	No Jurisdiction
164.	Loved one relayed concerns regarding their son needing an attorney to address his mental health needs.	The OCO declined to investigate the concern per WAC 138-10-040(3)(e) as the requested resolution is not within the ombuds' statutory power and authority.	No Jurisdiction
165.	Loved one relayed concerns regarding an individual that is housed at SCORE.	The OCO declined to investigate the concern per WAC 138-10-040(3)(a) as the ombuds does not have jurisdiction over the complaint as the complaint relates to an action taken by an agency other than the Washington State Department of Corrections (WADOC) or occurred while an individual was not in full or partial confinement of a Washington State	No Jurisdiction

		Department of Corrections prison, such as jails.	
166.	Individual relayed concerns regarding the conduct of their community corrections officer.	The OCO declined to investigate the concern per WAC 138-10-040(3)(a) as the ombuds does not have jurisdiction over the complaint as the complaint relates to an action taken by an agency other than the Washington State Department of Corrections (WADOC) or occurred while an individual was not in full or partial confinement of a Washington State Department of Corrections prison, such as jails.	No Jurisdiction
167.	Family member relayed concerns regarding their loved one that is housed at a county jail.	The OCO declined to review the concern per WAC 138-10-040(3)(a) as the ombuds does not have jurisdiction over the complaint as the complaint relates to an action taken by an agency other than the Washington State Department of Corrections (WADOC) or occurred while an individual was not in full or partial confinement of a Washington State Department of Corrections prison, such as jails.	No Jurisdiction
168.	Individual relayed concerns regarding the conduct of their community corrections officer.	The OCO declined to investigate the concern per WAC 138-10-040(3)(a) as the ombuds does not have jurisdiction over the complaint as the complaint relates to an action taken by an agency other than the Washington State Department of Corrections (WADOC) or occurred while an individual was not in full or partial confinement of a Washington State Department of Corrections prison.	No Jurisdiction
169.	Individual relayed concerns regarding the conduct of their community corrections officer.	The OCO declined to investigate the concern per WAC 138-10-040(3)(a) as the ombuds does not have jurisdiction over the complaint as the complaint relates to an action taken by an agency other than the Washington State Department of Corrections (WADOC) or occurred while an individual was not in full or partial confinement of a Washington State Department of Corrections prison, such as jails.	No Jurisdiction
170.	Loved one relayed concerns regarding the conduct of their husband's community corrections officer preventing visitation.	The OCO declined to investigate the concern per WAC 138-10-040(3)(a) as the ombuds does not have jurisdiction over the complaint as the complaint relates to an action taken by an agency other than the Washington State Department of Corrections (WADOC) or occurred while an individual was not in full or partial confinement of a Washington State Department of Corrections prison, such as jails.	No Jurisdiction
171.	Loved one relayed concerns regarding staff conduct concerns their brother has while housed at the Benton County Jail.	The OCO declined to investigate the concern per WAC 138-10-040(3)(a) as the ombuds does not have jurisdiction over the complaint as the complaint relates to an action taken by an agency other than the Washington State Department of Corrections (WADOC) or occurred while an individual was not in full or partial confinement of a Washington State Department of Corrections prison, such as jails.	No Jurisdiction
172.	Loved one relayed concerns regarding the jail their son is housed out at not providing him with his packages.	The OCO declined to investigate the concern per WAC 138-10-040(3)(a) as the ombuds does not have jurisdiction over the complaint as the complaint relates to an action taken by an agency other than the Washington State Department of Corrections (WADOC) or occurred while an individual was not in full or partial confinement of a Washington State Department of Corrections prison, such as jails.	No Jurisdiction
173.	Loved one relayed concerns regarding there being no air conditioning at the jail their brother is housed at.	The OCO declined to investigate the concern per WAC 138-10-040(3)(a) as the ombuds does not have jurisdiction over the complaint as the complaint relates to an action taken by an agency other than the Washington State Department of Corrections (WADOC) or occurred while an individual was not in full or partial confinement of a Washington State Department of Corrections prison, such as jails.	No Jurisdiction
174.	Individual relayed concerns regarding wanting an investigation done into the	The OCO declined to investigate the concern per WAC 138-10-040(3)(a) as the ombuds does not have jurisdiction over the complaint as the complaint relates to an action taken by an agency other than the	No Jurisdiction

	supervision practices being imposed by a particular community corrections field office.	Washington State Department of Corrections (WADOC) or occurred while an individual was not in full or partial confinement of a Washington State Department of Corrections prison, such as jails.	
Reentry Center - Eleanor Chase House - Spokane			
175.	Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding needing a state-appointed attorney.	The OCO declined to investigate the concern per WAC 138-10-040(3)(e) as the requested resolution is not within the ombuds' statutory power and authority.	No Jurisdiction
176.	A person living in a reentry facility reported a concern related to staff behavior and their J&S being incorrect.	Prior to OCO involvement, the incarcerated person has options for resolving the concern through a DOC appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. If the individual's concern is not addressed by these DOC processes, they can then contact the OCO for assistance. The OCO provided technical assistance about reporting the concerns through the Resolution Program and appealing to the appropriate level prior to reaching out to the OCO.	Technical Assistance Provided
Reentry Center - Helen B. Ratcliff - King			
177.	A friend or family member reported a concern on this person's behalf regarding staff conduct at the Helen B. Ratcliff Reentry Center.	The incarcerated individual did not respond to the OCO's request for permission to investigate and/or additional information within 30 days. The OCO encouraged the incarcerated person to contact the OCO via mail or hotline if they would like to request assistance.	Complaint Withdrawn
Reentry Center - Longview - Cowlitz			
178.	Loved one relayed concerns regarding difficulties their partner is having with their CCO.	The OCO declined to investigate the concern per WAC 138-10-040(3)(a) as the ombuds does not have jurisdiction over the complaint as the complaint relates to an action taken by an agency other than the Washington State Department of Corrections (WADOC) or occurred while an individual was not in full or partial confinement of a Washington State Department of Corrections prison, such as jails.	No Jurisdiction
Reentry Center - Olympia - Thurston			
179.	Loved one relayed concerns regarding their son not being let out of his cell at the jail he is housed at.	The OCO declined to investigate the concern per WAC 138-10-040(3)(a) as the ombuds does not have jurisdiction over the complaint as the complaint relates to an action taken by an agency other than the Washington State Department of Corrections (WADOC) or occurred while an individual was not in full or partial confinement of a Washington State Department of Corrections prison, such as jails.	No Jurisdiction
Reentry Center - Reynolds - King			
180.	Individual reported concerns regarding their release date.	Per WAC 138-10-040(3), the OCO declined to investigate the complaint beyond intake because the person was released from DOC custody prior to OCO action.	Declined
181.	Individual passed away after escaping DOC custody.	The OCO reviewed relevant records and incident reports and declined to refer this case to the UFR Committee. WAC 138-10-040(3) states the ombuds may close any investigation that does not involve complaints about an alleged department action. The individual escaped a reentry center in the 1980's and did not have contact with DOC leading up to his passing in the community.	Declined
Stafford Creek Corrections Center			
182.	Loved one relayed concerns about follow up medical care for an incarcerated individual.	This case is a duplicate of one that already exists in the OCO case management system.	Complaint Withdrawn

183.	Incarcerated individual shared concerns regarding DOC holding them in administrative segregation for a prolonged period of time due to an investigation.	The incarcerated individual said they did not want the OCO to further investigate the complaint and closed the case.	Complaint Withdrawn
184.	Loved one relayed concerns regarding books they sent to an incarcerated individual being rejected.	The OCO declined to investigate the concern per WAC 138-10-040(3)(g) any other reasons the ombuds deems relevant to the complaint, including, but not limited to, the priority and weight given to these and other relevant factors. Due to extremely limited resources, the OCO is unable to investigate concerns regarding mail or property.	Declined
185.	Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding being suspended from their job.	The OCO declined to move the complaint beyond the intake investigation phase per WAC 138-10-040(3)(g) as at this time the OCO is unable to investigate complaints addressing general jobs due to extremely limited resources.	Declined
186.	Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding their tort claim not moving forward.	The OCO declined to investigate the concern per WAC 138-10-040(3)(a) as the ombuds does not have jurisdiction over the complaint as the complaint relates to an action taken by an agency other than the Washington State Department of Corrections (WADOC)	No Jurisdiction
187.	A friend or family member reported a concern related to the classification and housing assignment of an incarcerated person.	Prior to OCO involvement, the incarcerated person has options for resolving the concern through a DOC appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. If the individual's concern is not addressed by these DOC processes, they can then contact the OCO for assistance. The OCO verified that the incarcerated person has not provided any information regarding their current safety concerns to DOC. The OCO also provided technical assistance about how to appeal custody facility plans and report safety concerns to DOC.	Technical Assistance Provided
188.	A friend or family member reported a concern related to the classification and housing assignment of an incarcerated person.	Prior to OCO involvement, the incarcerated person has options for resolving the concern through a DOC appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. If the individual's concern is not addressed by these DOC processes, they can then contact the OCO for assistance. The OCO verified that the incarcerated person has not provided any information regarding their current safety concerns to DOC. The OCO also provided technical assistance about how to appeal custody facility plans and report safety concerns to DOC.	Technical Assistance Provided
189.	A friend or family member of an incarcerated person reported a concern related to a visitation denial and DOC staff behavior.	Prior to OCO involvement, the incarcerated person has options for resolving the concern through a DOC appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. If the individual's concern is not addressed by these DOC processes, they can then contact the OCO for assistance. The OCO provided technical assistance about how to appeal visitation denials and how their loved one can report a staff behavior concern.	Technical Assistance Provided
190.	External person reported concerns regarding their loved one's access to medical care and accommodations for mobility issues.	Prior to OCO involvement, the incarcerated person has options for resolving the concern through a DOC appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. If the individual's concern is not addressed by these DOC processes, they can then contact the OCO for assistance. The OCO provided technical assistance about filing Health Services resolution requests.	Technical Assistance Provided
191.	External person reported that their loved one was not provided with specialist care after sustaining an injury. The external person requested that their loved one be sent	Prior to OCO involvement, the incarcerated person has options for resolving the concern through a DOC appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. If the individual's concern is not addressed by these DOC processes, they can then contact the OCO for assistance. The OCO provided technical assistance about the process to be approved for outside specialty healthcare.	Technical Assistance Provided

	to a specialist and receive a treatment plan.		
192.	External person reported that their loved one was not provided with specialist care after sustaining an injury. The external person requested that their loved one be sent to a specialist and receive a treatment plan.	Prior to OCO involvement, the incarcerated person has options for resolving the concern through a DOC appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. If the individual's concern is not addressed by these DOC processes, they can then contact the OCO for assistance. The OCO provided technical assistance about the process to be approved for outside specialty healthcare.	Technical Assistance Provided
193.	External person reports concerns regarding their loved one's access to advanced imaging and medication changes. The external person stated that their loved one's condition is worsening and that their attempts to reach out to the facility have gone unanswered.	Prior to OCO involvement, the incarcerated person has options for resolving the concern through a DOC appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. If the individual's concern is not addressed by these DOC processes, they can then contact the OCO for assistance. The OCO provided technical assistance about the DOC Health Plan approval process and filing resolutions.	Technical Assistance Provided
194.	External person reports their loved one is not receiving the medical attention they require.	Prior to OCO involvement, the incarcerated person has options for resolving the concern through a DOC appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. If the individual's concern is not addressed by these DOC processes, they can then contact the OCO for assistance. The OCO provided technical assistance about filing Health Services resolution requests.	Technical Assistance Provided
195.	An incarcerated person reported a concern related to DOC charging for certified mail and not providing accurate tracking information.	Prior to OCO involvement, the incarcerated person has options for resolving the concern through a DOC appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. If the individual's concern is not addressed by these DOC processes, they can then contact the OCO for assistance. The OCO provided technical assistance about how to appeal Resolution Requests to level 3 and how to file a tort claim for lost funds. The OCO also reviewed records and found that the incarcerated person misread the tracking number provided, verified the correct number and ensured the person was provided that correct tracking number which is valid.	Technical Assistance Provided
196.	An incarcerated person reported a concern regarding legal property quantity limits being applied.	Prior to OCO involvement, the incarcerated person has options for resolving the concern through a DOC appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. If the individual's concern is not addressed by these DOC processes, they can then contact the OCO for assistance. The OCO provided technical assistance about appealing their Resolution Request up to level 3 prior to contacting the OCO.	Technical Assistance Provided
197.	An incarcerated person reported a concern related to their classification and facility placement.	Prior to OCO involvement, the incarcerated person has options for resolving the concern through a DOC appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. If the individual's concern is not addressed by these DOC processes, they can then contact the OCO for assistance. The OCO verified that the incarcerated person has not provided any information regarding their current safety concerns to DOC. The OCO also provided technical assistance about how to appeal custody facility plans.	Technical Assistance Provided
198.	Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding their extended family visits (EFVs) being denied with their	Prior to OCO involvement, the incarcerated person has options for resolving the concern through a DOC appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. If the individual's concern is not addressed by these DOC processes, they can then contact the OCO for assistance. The OCO	Technical Assistance Provided

	wife.	provided technical assistance about how to appeal an EFV denial.	
199.	An incarcerated person reported a concern related to a denied extended family visit application.	Prior to OCO involvement, the incarcerated person has options for resolving the concern through a DOC appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. If the individual's concern is not addressed by these DOC processes, they can then contact the OCO for assistance. The OCO provided technical assistance about how to appeal extended family visit denials.	Technical Assistance Provided
200.	An incarcerated person reported that they were injured by DOC action and requested compensation from DOC for those injuries.	Prior to OCO involvement, the incarcerated person has options for resolving the concern through a DOC appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. If the individual's concern is not addressed by these DOC processes, they can then contact the OCO for assistance. The OCO provided technical assistance about how to file a tort claim.	Technical Assistance Provided
201.	An incarcerated person reported a concern related to the behavior of a DOC staff member.	Prior to OCO involvement, the incarcerated person has options for resolving the concern through a DOC appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. If the individual's concern is not addressed by these DOC processes, they can then contact the OCO for assistance. The OCO provided technical assistance about appealing the reported DOC staff behavior through the DOC Resolution Program to level 2 prior to reaching out to the OCO.	Technical Assistance Provided
202.	An incarcerated person reported a concern related to the mail room and receiving legal mail.	Prior to OCO involvement, the incarcerated person has options for resolving the concern through a DOC appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. If the individual's concern is not addressed by these DOC processes, they can then contact the OCO for assistance. The OCO provided technical assistance about contacting the law library and filing a Resolution Request before contacting the OCO.	Technical Assistance Provided
Washington Corrections Center			
203.	External person reported that their loved one is not receiving treatment for Opioid Use Disorder. This person is requesting that their loved one receive medication for that condition.	This case was a duplicate of one that already existed from the same complainant and for the same concern. The impacted person was notified that this issue is being investigated in the originally reported case and that the duplicate cases would be closed.	Complaint Withdrawn
204.	External person reported that their loved one is not receiving treatment for Opioid Use Disorder. This person is requesting that their loved one receive medication for that condition.	This case was a duplicate of one that already existed from the same complainant and for the same concern. The impacted person was notified that this issue is being investigated in the originally reported case and that the duplicate cases would be closed.	Complaint Withdrawn
205.	External person reported that their loved one is not receiving treatment for Opioid Use Disorder. This person is requesting that their loved one receive medication for that condition.	This case was a duplicate of one that already existed from the same complainant and for the same concern. The impacted person was notified that this issue is being investigated in the originally reported case and that the duplicate cases would be closed.	Complaint Withdrawn
206.	External person reported that their loved one is not receiving treatment for Opioid Use Disorder. This person is requesting that their	This case was a duplicate of one that already existed from the same complainant and for the same concern. The impacted person was notified that this issue is being investigated in the originally reported case and that the duplicate cases would be closed.	Complaint Withdrawn

	loved one receive medication for that condition.		
207.	External person reported that their loved one is not receiving treatment for Opioid Use Disorder. This person is requesting that their loved one receive medication for that condition.	This case was a duplicate of one that already existed from the same complainant and for the same concern. The impacted person was notified that this issue is being investigated in the originally reported case and that the duplicate cases would be closed.	Complaint Withdrawn
208.	A friend or family member reported concerns about staff conduct on this person's behalf.	The incarcerated individual did not respond to the OCO's request for permission to investigate and/or additional information within 30 days. The OCO encouraged the incarcerated person to contact the OCO via mail or hotline if they would like to request assistance.	Complaint Withdrawn
209.	A friend or family member reported a concern regarding potential negative impacts if their loved one is stepped down too soon from MOUD treatment.	The incarcerated individual did not respond to the OCO's request for permission to investigate and/or additional information within 30 days. The OCO encouraged the incarcerated person to contact the OCO via mail or hotline if they would like to request assistance.	Complaint Withdrawn
210.	Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding needing a replacement tablet.	The OCO declined to move the complaint beyond the intake investigation phase per WAC 138-10-040(3)(g) as at this time the OCO is unable to investigate complaints addressing tablets due to extremely limited resources.	Declined
211.	Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding wanting information about a stipulated agreement they made with the ISRB.	The OCO declined to investigate the concern per WAC 138-10-040(3)(a) as the ombuds does not have jurisdiction over the complaint as the complaint relates to an action taken by an agency other than the Washington State Department of Corrections (WADOC).	No Jurisdiction
212.	External person reported that their loved one is being kept in the reception center and his transfer to a regular facility is being held up by DOC not performing his initial physical. They are requesting that the person receive his physical so he can move on to his next facility.	Prior to OCO involvement, the incarcerated person has options for resolving the concern through a DOC appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. If the individual's concern is not addressed by these DOC processes, they can then contact the OCO for assistance. The OCO provided technical assistance about filing resolution requests.	Technical Assistance Provided
213.	External person reported that their loved one was threatened by DOC staff for asking for forms during a lockdown.	Prior to OCO involvement, the incarcerated person has options for resolving the concern through a DOC appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. If the individual's concern is not addressed by these DOC processes, they can then contact the OCO for assistance. The OCO provided technical assistance about reporting DOC staff behavior through the DOC Resolution Program prior to reaching out to the OCO.	Technical Assistance Provided
214.	Person reported concerns regarding a DOC staff member targeting him with daily cell searches. The person is requesting that the staff member be held accountable.	Prior to OCO involvement, the incarcerated person has options for resolving the concern through a DOC appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. If the individual's concern is not addressed by these DOC processes, they can then contact the OCO for assistance. The OCO provided technical assistance about reporting DOC staff behavior through the DOC Resolution Program and appealing infractions prior to reaching out to the OCO.	Technical Assistance Provided
215.	A friend or family member	Prior to OCO involvement, the incarcerated person has options for	Technical

	reported a concern related to the behavior of a DOC staff member and missing property.	resolving the concern through a DOC appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. If the individual's concern is not addressed by these DOC processes, they can then contact the OCO for assistance. The OCO provided technical assistance about appealing resolution requests and how to file a tort claim.	Assistance Provided
216.	Person reported that DOC has not provided a medical exam that is required for him to transfer to his home facility. The person is requesting to receive his initial physical so he can move on to his home facility.	Prior to OCO involvement, the incarcerated person has options for resolving the concern through a DOC appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. If the individual's concern is not addressed by these DOC processes, they can then contact the OCO for assistance. The OCO provided technical assistance about filing resolution requests.	Technical Assistance Provided
217.	Incarcerated individual reported a concern related to the way banking at DOC works.	Prior to OCO involvement, the incarcerated person has options for resolving the concern through a DOC appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. If the individual's concern is not addressed by these DOC processes, they can then contact the OCO for assistance. The OCO provided technical assistance about the need to appeal any Resolution Request filed to the appropriate level.	Technical Assistance Provided
218.	An incarcerated person reported a concern related to a banking issue.	Prior to OCO involvement, the incarcerated person has options for resolving the concern through a DOC appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. If the individual's concern is not addressed by these DOC processes, they can then contact the OCO for assistance. The OCO provided technical assistance about appealing issues through the Resolution Program to level 3.	Technical Assistance Provided
219.	Individual reported that he was assaulted and his property was lost when he was taken to the hospital.	The OCO contacted the facility about this concern and provided the individual with technical assistance regarding property concerns and how to appeal a property decision.	Technical Assistance Provided
220.	Individual reported concerns regarding work release and graduated reentry denial.	The OCO provided technical assistance regarding graduated reentry screening, pathways, and eligibility.	Technical Assistance Provided
221.	An incarcerated person reported a concern related to their classification and facility placement.	Prior to OCO involvement, the incarcerated person has options for resolving the concern through a DOC appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. If the individual's concern is not addressed by these DOC processes, they can then contact the OCO for assistance. The OCO provided technical assistance about how to appeal classification decisions.	Technical Assistance Provided
Washington Corrections Center for Women			
222.	An incarcerated person called to follow up on a case that was previously reported by a family member and closed due to no response from the incarcerated person. The original concern was regarding the behavior of a DOC staff member.	Prior to OCO involvement, the incarcerated person has options for resolving the concern through a DOC appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. If the individual's concern is not addressed by these DOC processes, they can then contact the OCO for assistance. The OCO provided technical assistance about reporting DOC staff behavior through the DOC Resolution Program prior to reaching out to the OCO.	Technical Assistance Provided
223.	An incarcerated person reported a concern related to DOC disposing of their property and wanting that	Prior to OCO involvement, the incarcerated person has options for resolving the concern through a DOC appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. If the individual's concern is not addressed by these DOC processes, they can then contact the OCO for assistance. The OCO	Technical Assistance Provided

	property replaced.	provided technical assistance about how to file a tort claim & file a staff behavior complaint through the resolution program.	
Washington State Penitentiary			
224.	A friend or family member reported a concern regarding their loved one's placement on Administrative Segregation.	The incarcerated individual did not respond to the OCO's request for permission to investigate and/or additional information within 30 days. The OCO encouraged the incarcerated person to contact the OCO via mail or hotline if they would like to request assistance.	Complaint Withdrawn
225.	A friend or family member reported a concern regarding this person's classification and safety if transferred to another facility.	The incarcerated individual did not respond to the OCO's request for permission to investigate and/or additional information within 30 days. The OCO encouraged the incarcerated person to contact the OCO via mail or hotline if they would like to request assistance.	Complaint Withdrawn
226.	A friend or family member reported a concern on the incarcerated person's behalf regarding DOC's decision to deny a requested funeral escort.	The incarcerated individual did not respond to the OCO's request for permission to investigate and/or additional information within 30 days. The OCO encouraged the incarcerated person to contact the OCO via mail or hotline if they would like to request assistance.	Complaint Withdrawn
227.	A friend or family member reported a concern regarding their loved one being placed on a MAX program.	The incarcerated individual did not respond to the OCO's request for permission to investigate and/or additional information within 30 days. The OCO encouraged the incarcerated person to contact the OCO via mail or hotline if they would like to request assistance.	Complaint Withdrawn
228.	Incarcerated individual relayed concerns regarding wanting the conduct of Walla Walla Community College looked into.	The OCO declined to investigate the concern per WAC 138-10-040(3)(a) as the ombuds does not have jurisdiction over the complaint as the complaint relates to an action taken by an agency other than the Washington State Department of Corrections (WADOC).	No Jurisdiction
229.	An incarcerated person reported a concern related to extended family visits (EFVs) that they have not yet applied for.	Prior to OCO involvement, the incarcerated person has options for resolving the concern through a DOC appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. If the individual's concern is not addressed by these DOC processes, they can then contact the OCO for assistance. The OCO provided technical assistance about the need to apply for EFVs and appeal any denial if they occur prior to reaching out to the OCO.	Technical Assistance Provided
230.	An incarcerated person reported a concern related to a safety issue, classification and housing.	Prior to OCO involvement, the incarcerated person has options for resolving the concern through a DOC appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. If the individual's concern is not addressed by these DOC processes, they can then contact the OCO for assistance. The OCO verified that the incarcerated person has not provided any information regarding their current safety concerns to DOC. The OCO also provided technical assistance about how to appeal custody facility plans and report safety concerns to DOC.	Technical Assistance Provided
231.	An incarcerated person reported a concern related to the lack of AC in the unit.	Prior to OCO involvement, the incarcerated person has options for resolving the concern through a DOC appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. If the individual's concern is not addressed by these DOC processes, they can then contact the OCO for assistance. The OCO provided technical assistance about engaging with the Resolution Program prior to requesting assistance from the OCO.	Technical Assistance Provided
232.	Incarcerated individual shared concerns regarding not receiving medical care.	Prior to OCO involvement, the incarcerated person has options for resolving the concern through a DOC appeals process or the DOC Resolution Program. If the individual's concern is not addressed by these DOC processes, they can then contact the OCO for assistance. The OCO	Technical Assistance Provided

provided technical assistance about filing a resolution request.

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(2)(k) directs the ombuds to render a public decision on the merits of each complaint at the conclusion of an investigation. All cases opened by the OCO are considered investigations for the purposes of the statute. The OCO opens an investigation for every complaint received by this office. The following pages serve as public decisions required by statute.

Case Closure Reason	Meaning
Unexpected Fatality Review	The incarcerated person died unexpectedly and the death was reviewed by the Unexpected Fatality Review Committee, as required by RCW 72.09.770.
Assistance Provided	The OCO achieved full or partial resolution of the person's complaint.
Information Provided	The OCO provided individualized self-advocacy or case-specific information.
DOC Addressed the Complaint	DOC staff addressed the concern prior to OCO action.
Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate	Available evidence was insufficient to substantiate the concern.
No Violation of DOC Policy	The OCO determined that DOC did not violate DOC policy or no applicable DOC policy existed.
Substantiated	The OCO verified the concern but was unable to achieve a resolution to the concern.
Complaint Withdrawn	The incarcerated individual did not provide permission to proceed with an investigation or asked OCO to close the complaint, or OCO staff opened the complaint in error.
Declined	The OCO declined to investigate the complaint per WAC 138-10-040(3).
No Jurisdiction	The complaint did not meet OCO's jurisdictional requirements set forth in RCW 43.06C.040(2)(e).
Technical Assistance Provided	The OCO provided general self-advocacy information to resolve the concern through a DOC process prior to OCO involvement.

The OCO implemented new case closure reasons in July 2025.
This change aligns with the agency's goals of ensuring that materials are accessible and ensuring transparency in data reporting.

Monthly outcome reports are available on Securus tablets, in law libraries, and online at https://oco.wa.gov/reports-publications/reports.

Common DOC Acronyms & Glossary

ADA: Americans with Disabilities Act

ASR: Accommodation Status Report

BOE: Behavior Observation Entry

CI: Correctional Industries

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

CO: Correctional Officer

CPA: Community Parenting Alternative

CRC: Care Review Committee

CUS: Correctional Unit Supervisor

DES: Department of Enterprise Services

DOSA: Drug Offender Sentencing Alternative

EFV: Extended Family Visit

ERD: Earned Release Date

EMP: Extraordinary Medical Placement

GRE: Graduated Reentry

HCSC: Headquarters Community Screening Committee

HSR: Health Status Report

IIU or I&I: DOC's Intelligence and Investigations Unit

J&S: Judgment and Sentence

MAT: Medication Assisted Treatment

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

PULHES codes: Washington DOC assigns health services codes to every incarcerated individual. These codes are meant to note the presence and severity of various health-related factors, such as medication delivery requirements, mobility limitations, developmental disability, and frequency of use of mental health services.

SARU: Substance Abuse Recovery Unit

SSOSA: Special Sex Offender Sentencing Alternative

SOTAP: Sex Offender Treatment and Assessment Program

SVP: Sexually Violent Predator

TC: Therapeutic Community

WaONE: Washington ONE ("Offender Needs Evaluation")

DOC Prisons

AHCC: Airway Heights Corrections Center
CBCC: Clallam Bay Corrections Center
CCCC: Cedar Creek Corrections Center
CRCC: Coyote Ridge Corrections Center
MCC: Monroe Correctional Complex
MCCCW: Mission Creek Corrections Center for Women
OCC: Olympic Corrections Center
SCCC: Stafford Creek Corrections Center
WCC: Washington Corrections Center
WCCW: Washington Corrections Center for Women
WSP: Washington State Penitentiary