

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

Case Closure Reason	Meaning	Total
Assistance Provided	The OCO achieved full or partial resolution of the person's complaint.	15
Information Provided	The OCO provided self-advocacy information.	26
DOC Resolved	DOC staff resolved the concern prior to OCO action.	24
Administrative Remedies Not Pursued	The incarcerated person did not yet pursue internal resolution per RCW 43.06C.040(2)(b).	55
Substantiated Without Resolution	The OCO verified the concern but was unable to achieve a resolution to the concern.	12
Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate	Insufficient evidence existed to substantiate the concern.	17
No Violation of Policy	The OCO determined that DOC policy was not violated.	31
Unexpected Fatality Review	The incarcerated person died unexpectedly, and the death is under review.	0
Person Left DOC Custody	The incarcerated person left DOC custody prior to OCO action.	1
Person Declined OCO Involvement	The person did not want the OCO to pursue the concern or the OCO received no response to requests for more information.	1
Lacked Jurisdiction	The complaint did not meet OCO's jurisdictional requirements (typically when complaint is not about an incarcerated person or not about a DOC action).	14
Declined	The OCO declined to investigate because the complaint had already been investigated by this office.	0

Monthly Outcome Report: June 2022

Institution of Incident	Complaint Summary	Outcome Summary	Case Closure Reason
Airway Heights Corrections Center			
1.	Family reports concerns regarding an infraction.	The OCO provided self-advocacy information related to RCW 43.06C which requires that the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve a concern through the grievance process, administrative actions, and/or an appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
2.	The incarcerated person reports the facility is using group punishment by celling everyone in when others are not following the rules. The person says it is unfair because officers congregate five in a station but then require incarcerated individuals to sit two at a table.	The OCO provided self-advocacy information related to RCW 43.06C which requires that the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve a concern through the grievance process, administrative actions, and/or an appellate process or if more than 90 days have passed since filing the grievance before the OCO may investigate the case.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
3.	The incarcerated individual got infractioned for a 752 for a piece of paper they found in his shoe and they said it was drugs. He went to the hearing and was found guilty. He asked for the paper to be sent to a lab for an outside test and DOC staff said they would not do that. DOC policy says that upon receiving infraction report should have hearing within five days and he never received any extension information. During the hearing he asked hearings officer to question the staff member who did the test and the hearings officer told him no.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
4.	The incarcerated individual reports that the facility is telling people that they have to sit two to a table for COVID safety protocols and there is not enough room for everyone to sit at a table given the number of people and tables.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued

5.	<p>The incarcerated individual says he receives regular wound care with an offsite provider every two weeks. Individual was placed in quarantine after visiting the hospital recently. He filed an emergency grievance for inappropriate use of quarantine, which was reduced to regular grievance by DOC. While on quarantine, the individual was not receiving hot food, letters, or regular water bottles, and also reports the water is not sanitary and he cannot access filtered day room water while in his cell. Additionally, food package was sent to his regular unit and did not arrive to quarantine unit. He also reports letters to Ombuds are not being mailed as legal mail in T-Unit.</p>	<p>The OCO provided the incarcerated individual with information regarding Resolution Program and self-advocacy steps regarding meals, water, and mail. The OCO relayed that placement on quarantine status following some outside appointments is based on COVID spread mitigation efforts.</p>	<p>Administrative Remedies Not Pursued</p>
6.	<p>A family member shared concerns that their loved one was infractioned for contraband that was allegedly put there by a staff member they are taking legal action against. They are requesting their loved one get a transfer for safety reasons.</p>	<p>The incarcerated person has not pursued an internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance or administrative or appellate process. The OCO could not locate an appeal of the infraction nor a resolution request regarding staff misconduct. All institution assignments/transfers are under RCW 72.02.240 and have an extensive administrative review process, which would need to be appealed.</p>	<p>Administrative Remedies Not Pursued</p>
7.	<p>An incarcerated person reported that during an assessment, in response to a question about drug use, he stated that his crimes had nothing to do with drugs per his criminal history and would not need treatment. The individual alleges that the DOC staff took this as a denial of programming and presented him with an infraction without the assessment's completion for recommendations or verifying if this was a statement of refusal.</p>	<p>The incarcerated person has not pursued an internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process. This person would need to appeal the infraction.</p>	<p>Administrative Remedies Not Pursued</p>

8.	A family member called to report his son was moved from general population to a COVID unit. Staff will not tell the individual why he was moved, and they took him off his job to put him there. The individual requested a rapid test and staff would not give him one. He is the only individual in his pod who was taken to the COVID unit; staff did not take his cellmate either. DOC staff are not giving the individual water or hygiene items. He never received a positive COVID test and does not understand why or how he was put in a COVID unit.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
9.	The incarcerated person reports that they attempted to break up a fight involving their cellmate, however, they were infractioned for the assault along with the roommate. The person claims that DOC staff did not properly investigate the incident.	Administrative remedies were not pursued: The OCO could not locate an appeal to the infraction this person has concerns with. The incarcerated person has to pursue an internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
10.	Incarcerated individual reports that DOC staff are not doing anything to help with the "spice" (synthetic cannabinoids) that is coming in through the mail. They report that when the sergeants are not here that the officers do not help get the spice out of the units.	The incarcerated individual has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
11.	The incarcerated person shared concerns that he and others are being moved from minimum to medium units because DOC staff members claim other units are not available. This person has back issues and was being accommodated until the move.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
12.	The incarcerated person shared concerns regarding the hearings officer stating they would move forward with the infraction hearing without the requested witness statements.	The OCO provided self-advocacy information related to RCW 43.06C which requires that the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve a concern through the grievance process, administrative actions, and/or an appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued

The request for the statement was sent a month ago, but the person who gets the statements typically is on vacation. The person said he believes that his due process rights are being violated, and DOC is actively trying to remove him from camp via the infraction process.

13.	The incarcerated individual's cell was searched, and their personal items were thrown on the floor and damaged. The incarcerated individual requested that DOC take photos for evidence, but their request was refused. In response, the incarcerated individual filed an emergency grievance, which DOC did not respond to.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
14.	The incarcerated individual reports that a female officer is being inappropriate. She wrote a behavior observation entry (BOE) on him after another person told her that he was going to get her fired. This person reports that the staff member is trying to get him taken off the unit.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
15.	Incarcerated individual reports DOC gave them a 709 infraction for being out of bounds but conducted the hearing without them. They said they never waived their right to the hearing and were told by a staff they heard about this happening to another person. The officer who served them their paper did not share the rights and they wanted to go to this hearing.	The OCO reviewed the infraction and appeal packet and found that the individual signed the right to waive their appearance at the hearing based on his selection of this option on the DOC form "Disciplinary Hearing Notice/Appearance Waiver." However, because the incarcerated individual did intend to attend this hearing, the OCO contacted DOC about this concern. DOC admitted that the officer who aided in completing this form checked the wrong box and the individual will now receive a new hearing that he can attend.	Assistance Provided
16.	Loved one of an incarcerated individual reports that DOC has delayed their marriage application for over two years due to the marriage packet applications being lost two times. Loved one reports that	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO alerted DOC staff of the delay in processing the marriage application and ensured that the marriage packet was processed per policy. The marriage packet is now being reviewed for a final decision by DOC headquarters.	Assistance Provided

they fear the marriage applications were mishandled due to biases that staff may hold against LGBTQ+ couples.

17.	Person needs someone to reach out to GRE and see the status of their application. The counselor submitted it in November and nothing has happened, and no one will make any extra effort on their behalf.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO notified DOC of this concern. DOC agreed to complete the process, and ultimately approved the person for the GRE program.	Assistance Provided
18.	Person is supposed to be released on Graduated Reentry Program (GRE), but they received a notification saying that they have a misdemeanor warrant. Person is concerned that the warrant is preventing them from being approved for GRE.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO review determined that the information related to the person's warrant was entered incorrectly in OMNI. As a result DOC changed status to misdemeanor warrant. Person will now be released on partial confinement GRE.	Assistance Provided
19.	A loved one submitted a concern about their husband who has been sent from unit to unit after coming out of the intensive management unit. They understand that he cannot have all of his property back while in a four-man cell, but both parties have requested several times that DOC staff bring him his hygiene and clean clothes, yet DOC staff have not done so.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO contacted the DOC about this concern. The DOC reported that this person received all of their property shortly before the OCO made contact. This office wrote this person and their loved one letters with this information.	DOC Resolved
20.	The incarcerated person shared concerns that his early release date is in less than a year, but DOC staff has not responded to his request to be enrolled in the necessary treatment for release.	DOC staff resolved this concern before the OCO took action on this complaint. The OCO was able to verify that the DOC had added this person to the programming list for enrollment before review by this office.	DOC Resolved
21.	The incarcerated individual is concerned about releasing to their county of origin. He wants to release to another county where he has more resources.	The OCO provided information regarding how to work with their counselor on their release plan. The OCO staff member on the hotline explained the next steps this person needs to take in order to make changes to their current release plan. This office wrote this person a letter with this information.	Information Provided
22.	The incarcerated individual reports that he only received one towel upon arriving to the	The OCO provided information regarding what the individual can do should he want to receive a replacement towel in the future.	Information Provided

facility, and that the towel looked like it had been used. The individual requested a new towel and was told no as the facility does not have enough towels to give out.

23.	<p>The incarcerated individual reports that he requested a transfer and his counselor told him that he must wait until the next six month review. He reports that he never received the previous six month review. The individual discussed his interest in transferring to another facility because he is seeking better medical care.</p>	<p>The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO reviewed available documentation and found that the individual did receive the previous six month classification review and it was decided by DOC staff to maintain his current classification.</p>	<p>Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate</p>
24.	<p>The incarcerated individual said that his DOSA was revoked for absconding but he says he did not abscond supervision. Person says he made numerous attempts to contact his Community Corrections Officer as well as report in person.</p>	<p>The OCO does not have jurisdiction over Community Custody concerns. The OCO did provide self-advocacy information for individual to submit their concern to the DOC using DOC 09-308 for the Board to review. Policy reference: DOC 320.110, Article V1. A. 1. Community Custody Violation/Revocation Hearings</p>	<p>Lacked Jurisdiction</p>
25.	<p>Incarcerated person was transferred to Washington from another state, and when they got to Washington, DOC took deductions out of their account. Person states this is against policy because the previous state that they were in also took out deductions. Incarcerated person believes the deductions were duplicative, and Washington should restore the funds that it withdrew.</p>	<p>The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO reviewed the deductions made, and the resolution request that the incarcerated person submitted regarding this concern. Per DOC Policy 200.000, anytime an individual receives a qualifying deposit, DOC is required to make certain withdrawals according to Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 72.09.480 (general cost of incarceration, legal financial obligations, and victim services fund), as well as RCW 72.09.450 (recoupment of costs). Even if funds were deducted from the person's account from another state, that would have been in accordance with that state's statute. The deductions made by Washington DOC are specific to Washington state, and are not duplicative.</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy</p>
26.	<p>This person was terminated from their CI job position and had five days of earned time taken from him.</p>	<p>The OCO verified DOC is following DOC 700.000 Work Programs in Prisons, which states that removal from mandatory programming may result in a loss of earned time. Additionally, per DOC 350.100 Earned Release Time, an incarcerated individual may be ineligible for earned time if s/he is not involved in mandatory programming as determined through the classification process and consistent with their Custody Facility Plan. This includes refusing mandatory programming or being</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy</p>

terminated from a program assignment for documented negative or substandard performance. Any type of refusal or termination is subject to loss of earned time points, regardless of any other programming.

27.	Incarcerated individual says their medical and mental health needs request was denied and ignored. Rather, while declaring a mental health emergency they were told to cell-in, further exacerbating their emotional distress and violating policy and procedures. The person was then issued an infraction.	The OCO reviewed the infraction packet and other related material and found there was evidence to substantiate the infractions, and the individual's mental health concerns were not ignored by DOC.	No Violation of Policy
28.	The incarcerated individual reports that DOC quarantined them without letting them know why. This person has grieved the issue and it was returned as not accepted.	The OCO was able to substantiate this concern but was not able to achieve a resolution. The OCO told the individual that people are cohorted and on quarantine to mitigate the spread of COVID. This office also wrote this person a letter with this information.	Substantiated Without Resolution
29.	Incarcerated individual's property was packed up by DOC staff after he was placed in the Special Management Unit (SMU) for a short time. Upon returning to the unit and receiving his property back, the individual found that his chess board is missing. The individual requests OCO assistance in locating the missing chess board.	The OCO was able to substantiate this concern but was not able to achieve a resolution. The OCO's review determined that DOC could not locate the chess board after a search was conducted. The OCO provided information to the individual about how to file a tort claim.	Substantiated Without Resolution

Cedar Creek Corrections Center

30.	Person reports that he has tried to get information from about GRE approval. Person should have been GRE eligible as of January.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. Person has been approved for work release since January; DOC is waiting for an available bed at the work release.	DOC Resolved
31.	Person says they are eligible for the GRE program. Person states Department of Corrections has placed a community concern hold in their case file prohibiting them from being eligible.	The OCO provided information regarding GRE program. Person still has two years until they become eligible to apply. The OCO could not identify a community concern hold noted for this person. Encouraged person to apply for GRE once he is within the timeline to apply.	Information Provided
32.	Person says that they are currently eligible for Graduated Reentry (GRE) Track 1 but have	The OCO lacks jurisdiction to investigate this complaint because the complaint relates to an action taken by an entity other than the	Lacked Jurisdiction

received conflicting and erroneous feedback from the counselors when applying. Person says that denial of their eligibility is legally untenable.

Washington State Department of Corrections. Where a work release operates under a contract with a third party, the person must be screened through additional approval through a panel that consists of community stakeholders that includes law enforcement. In this complaint, the person was denied based on a community concern identified by the panel. The OCO provided self-advocacy information regarding being reviewed for placement in another county without a contracted work release.

Clallam Bay Corrections Center

33.	Incarcerated individual received four serious infractions for participating in a gang-affiliated conspiracy. The individual says they were not part of this conspiracy and have evidence that shows they could not have been involved. They appealed the infractions but none of the appeals were upheld.	The OCO reviewed the infraction packet and confidential information related to the four infractions. There was evidence to substantiate each of the infractions based on the confidential information which satisfied the DOC standard of evidence for a guilty finding in an infraction of "some evidence."	No Violation of Policy
-----	---	--	------------------------

34.	Incarcerated person had a classification hearing last month. The individual's custody score had been increased, but they report that their custody level was not adjusted to match the appropriate custody for their score. The incarcerated person was maintained at close custody, when their points would have qualified them for medium custody.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO reviewed the incarcerated person's custody points and custody facility plan. While they did qualify for medium custody, they were maintained at close custody. The OCO requested additional information as to the override, and the appropriate DOC Headquarters classification committee member responded. The individual had several past acts on their record that DOC believed made them a continued threat, such that medium custody would not be appropriate. This is within the authority of the HCSC Committee, per DOC Policy 300.380 (Classification and Custody Facility Plan Review).	No Violation of Policy
-----	--	---	------------------------

35.	Person says that they were denied medical attention in a timely manner. Person says they submitted a kite and declared two medical emergencies over two days. Person was then seen by dental four days after the kite was sent.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO reviewed medical records and kites and contacted Health Services management. The patient was seen and was treated by medical staff for emergencies until the dentist was available. This is within the requirements set forth in DOC 610.650 Outpatient Services.	No Violation of Policy
-----	---	---	------------------------

Coyote Ridge Corrections Center

36.	Family reports incarcerated loved one has ongoing dental problem since he has been	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.062(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
-----	--	---	-------------------------------------

incarcerated. During this time, he has had all his remaining teeth extracted. He was told that he would be fitted for a set of full dentures. It is starting to impact his diet and his ability to eat certain foods. According to him, he is starting to develop sore or sensitive spots on his gums. He is concerned that this process has taken too long to complete. He would like to get this issue resolved as soon as possible. Family requests the OCO check on the status of the issue.

incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process. The OCO provided details about grievance and kite process related to medical concerns and OCO statute.

37.	The incarcerated individual reports that they have two cavities that have not been filled and it has been almost a year since it was diagnosed. The individual says they are afraid it has been too long and the teeth will need to be pulled. The individual has requested dental appointments several times.	The OCO provided self-advocacy information related to RCW 43.06C which requires that the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve a concern through the grievance process, administrative actions, and/or an appellate process or if more than 90 days have passed since filing the grievance before the OCO may investigate the case.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
38.	Person states that during a cell search an officer opened seven boxes of mac and cheese, a box of brown sugar and a Cup o' Noodles soup. The officer stuck his fingers into the food.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
39.	Person reports that they were demoted to Close Custody and is not being considered for an override based on an infraction that was later dismissed. Person reports they were found guilty of another infraction with the same officer who wrote up the first one. Person believes that they were set up by that officer to be closed out for his behavior and targeted as a racist. Person says there is no evidence to justify the officer's actions toward him.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
40.	The incarcerated individual submitted a kite to the	The OCO provided assistance by alerting the superintendent of this concern. The	Assistance Provided

superintendent which alleged a specific staff member of misconduct. The kite was opened by the same staff member who was named in the complaint. The staff member confronted incarcerated individual and now the individual feels unsafe and is concerned about retaliation.

superintendent agreed to meet with the individual to address the issue.

41.	Family member expressed concerns about an incarcerated individual receiving a 509 infraction for refusing orders and struggling with mental health due to COVID.	The OCO discussed the infraction several times with the facility upper-level management. DOC agreed to lower the infraction to a general if the individual remains infraction free for a set period of time.	Assistance Provided
42.	This person is requesting that Class three jobs get a pay raise.	The OCO advised the individual that pay increases are a legislative issue and this would need to be decided on by the Washington State legislature.	Information Provided
43.	Incarcerated individual states their property was lost. They state they grieved this concern and the resolution department looked for their property, but it was not located. Their glasses are included in the missing property which they need.	The OCO contacted DOC regarding this concern. DOC stated the only thing on the individual's matrix at the time of the transfer was reading glasses which the person should be able to purchase from the store if they report them missing and can also verify if they are missing by checking the pack out list. The OCO also advised the individual that they can file a tort claim for the glasses.	Information Provided
44.	The incarcerated individual was transferred from another facility and two boxes of their property are missing. They also never received their TV which should have arrived with their boxes of property.	The OCO provided information regarding the tort claim process. The OCO does not have the ability to replace lost property. This office provided the steps this person needs to take to seek reimbursement.	Information Provided
45.	The incarcerated individual reports that the resolution coordinator is not processing his complaints. He submitted three resolution requests that he believes have merit and has not received a response from the DOC resolution department.	The OCO was unable to substantiate this concern due to insufficient evidence. The DOC has documented that the resolution requests have been responded to and closed in their system. The OCO explained to the incarcerated individual how to obtain copies of the resolution responses either through the resolution department or through a public records request.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
46.	A family member called reporting that her loved one had been in a fight, but the family member had questions about the motivation for the fight and is concerned about her loved one's safety due to a	There was insufficient evidence for the OCO to verify the complainant's concern. The OCO could not substantiate the concern because no evidence exists that could prove the alleged motivations. The OCO's independent review showed that the DOC followed the Disciplinary Process policy 460.000 and the Classification Facility Plan Review policy 300.380. All institution assignments and	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate

recommended facility transfer. transfers are under RCW 72.02.240 and have an extensive administrative review process. Safety concerns are reviewed by DOC Headquarters Classification Unit prior to transfer.

47.	The incarcerated individual reports that he fell and hit his head and became unconscious during the night. He believes he was unconscious for several hours and when he came to, he pressed the emergency button several times and there was no response. He reports that he became unconscious again. When the cell doors opened in the morning, he reported the incident to staff and received medical attention. His main concern is that no one answered the emergency button and when staff did the 3:00am cell checks, they did not find him on the floor unconscious, meaning staff did not do the checks thoroughly.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. DOC staff did not report seeing the individual on the floor during tier checks nor receiving notifications that the individual's emergency button was pressed. Video footage confirmed that officers performed tier checks and walked by the individual's cell at 3:10am and 4:08am.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
48.	The incarcerated individual shared concerns that after the Department of Enterprise Services (DES) substantiated his property loss as the DOC's fault, the individual was only offered a third of what his items cost.	The OCO lacks jurisdiction to investigate the concern. The OCO lacks jurisdiction to investigate this complaint because the complaint relates to an action taken by an agency other than the Washington State Department of Corrections. The Department of Enterprise Services (DES) handles tort claims and decides the outcome, including if there is to be compensation.	Lacked Jurisdiction
49.	Incarcerated individual states they were working with DOC on their prison compact paperwork when DOC lost it and is now saying they have no idea where the paperwork is and they will have to restart the process.	The OCO contacted DOC regarding this concern. DOC acknowledges that the interstate compact form was misplaced and has not been recovered. This is being investigated at the facility and headquarters level. The incarcerated individual's counselor is aware of the issue and will prepare proper documentation for his next review.	Substantiated Without Resolution

Larch Corrections Center

50.	The incarcerated individual is reporting staff retaliation after they submitted several grievances and contacted the OCO about their concerns. The incarcerated individual received	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
-----	---	--	-------------------------------------

an infraction and has submitted an appeal but is concerned that they will be transferred to another facility soon.

51.	Incarcerated Individual reports the PREA Coordinator gave them an envelope that said confidential in red letters, they opened it and it was someone else's confidential PREA packet. They took the envelope to the person listed in the packet. They later met with staff again and told them the packet was not about them, it was someone else's and that they had given it to that person. Staff apologized to them and said it was not really confidential information, but they say the envelope directly said confidential. This situation made them and the other people in the unit uncomfortable, and they do not feel the confidentiality issue was addressed in this situation.	The OCO contacted DOC regarding this concern and have verified that the incident was immediately reported when the PREA form was given to the wrong individual, all individuals who were impacted were notified and DOC facility management appropriately investigated the concern to ensure the concern was taken seriously and appropriate curative action was followed.	DOC Resolved
-----	--	--	--------------

52.	Incarcerated Individual reports a concern about confidential PREA packet leaked by DOC staff. They state someone in the unit came up and asked their name and handed them a packet and told them it was their PREA information. The packet said confidential on the outside and had been taped but was given to another incarcerated person by a DOC staff member. Their confidential PREA investigation was seen by other incarcerated people because it was passed to them by staff. Staff tried to say the information was not confidential or a big deal and apologized to them and said he would self-report to the supervisor. They are still concerned that this happened to them and the information was given out to others. They	The OCO contacted DOC regarding this concern and have verified that the incident was immediately reported when the PREA form was given to the wrong individual, all individuals who were impacted were notified and DOC facility management appropriately investigated the concern to ensure the concern was taken seriously and appropriate curative action was followed.	DOC Resolved
-----	--	--	--------------

are concerned that the staff knew or was careless when giving the information to the wrong person.

Longview - Cowlitz County

53.	The person reports mistreatment by staff at work release. Person says the staff member made derogatory comments about this person's nationality and religion, cancelled their religious diet and they were put into handcuffs and taken to restrictive housing. Person also reports they have existing mental health issues and they do not understand the DOSA paperwork they signed. This concern is related to a pending work release infraction.	The OCO provided self-advocacy information related to RCW 43.06C which requires that the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve a concern through the grievance process, administrative actions, and/or an appellate process before the OCO may investigate the case. Individual can contact the OCO once they receive a DOC response to their appeal.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
-----	--	---	-------------------------------------

Mission Creek Corrections Center for Women

54.	Person was just transferred from WCCW to Mission Creek and they have lost a box of her property. She thinks the box got left at WCCW and wants someone to look into it for her.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process. No grievance on file could be found.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
-----	---	---	-------------------------------------

Monroe Correctional Complex

55.	The incarcerated individual reports that staff will not give him a job position. The individual reports that this is retaliation and says that mental health staff and security staff do not have congruence.	The OCO provided self-advocacy information related to RCW 43.06C which requires that the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve a concern through the grievance process, administrative actions, and/or an appellate process or if more than 90 days have passed since filing the grievance before the OCO may investigate the case.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
56.	The incarcerated person states that he was terminated from his job, not due to anything negative. Person states that the DOC did not conduct a Facility Risk Management Team meeting per policy. He was then rehired and staff told him to remind them of the start date to make sure he is on the payroll and would be eligible for back pay when the	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued

supervising staff came back to work from vacation. However, when the supervising staff member returned, the staff member who hired him back denied him back pay and told the incarcerated person he will not be paid for working.

57.	<p>The incarcerated individual reports that he has been attacked several times because he is trying to address misconduct and feels he is targeted by both staff and other incarcerated individuals. He is trying to submit keep separates because of this safety concern, but the DOC is not allowing him to. He is also scheduled to transfer but does not want to as he has safety concerns at that facility as well. He feels that he is in danger.</p>	<p>The OCO provided self-advocacy information related to RCW 43.06C which requires that the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve a concern through the grievance process, administrative actions, and/or an appellate process or if more than 90 days have passed since filing the grievance before the OCO may investigate the case.</p>	<p>Administrative Remedies Not Pursued</p>
58.	<p>The incarcerated individual reports another person threw a game piece from the game that he was playing with others. The person was removed, placed in the close observation unit, and a week later, came over to him and tried to start an altercation again. The person was told to remove himself from the unit and return to his own unit and was not infracted. The individual says he contacted his mental health counselor and asked if they had infracted the individual for being out of bounds. He was told that the person coming into the pod was only given a negative BOE. The individual is reporting that he was not given a positive BOE as a result of not reacting to the provocation. He is concerned that the correctional officers are setting him up for a major infraction and hoping that he will react to this type of provocation.</p>	<p>The OCO provided self-advocacy information related to RCW 43.06C which requires that the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve a concern through the grievance process, administrative actions, and/or an appellate process or if more than 90 days have passed since filing the grievance before the OCO may investigate the case.</p>	<p>Administrative Remedies Not Pursued</p>

59.	The incarcerated individual reports that Close Observation Area (COA) is being used as punishment for having issues and asking for help. He says staff deliberately ignore the pleas of incarcerated individuals and instead tell them to wait for tier checks. When an individual is in COA they are only allowed one 20-minute phone call per day.	The OCO provided self-advocacy information related to RCW 43.06C which requires that the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve a concern through the grievance process, administrative actions, and/or an appellate process or if more than 90 days have passed since filing the grievance before the OCO may investigate the case.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
60.	The incarcerated person reports that DOC staff in his unit are flashing lights in his face while sleeping as a form of retaliation. He has filed several complaints to no avail and DOC unit leadership staff are not acting to impact change.	The OCO provided self-advocacy information related to RCW 43.06C which requires that the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve a concern through the grievance process, administrative actions, and/or an appellate process or if more than 90 days have passed since filing the grievance before the OCO may investigate the case.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
61.	The incarcerated person shared concerns regarding DOC staff not adhering to the policy when he filed an emergency resolution request and it went unanswered.	The incarcerated person has not pursued an internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
62.	The person reports an individual was moved out of the unit last night then brought back to the unit the next day while an active PREA investigation is underway.	The OCO provided self-advocacy information related to RCW 43.06C which requires that the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve a concern through the grievance process, administrative actions, and/or an appellate process or if more than 90 days have passed since filing the grievance before the OCO may investigate the case.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
63.	Patient reports receiving hormone replacement therapy and being concerned that treatment dose is being reduced improperly with new provider.	The OCO provided assistance by contacting DOC Health Services management who agreed to request that changes to treatment be discussed with the patient before the changes are made. The DOC has added a new patient care navigator to mitigate future problems.	Assistance Provided
64.	Person says that medical has continuously mixed up his medical records and another person's medical records with the same last name. Staff are not being diligent about making sure they have the correct person.	The OCO provided assistance by contacting Health Services management about the error and were informed that the paperwork to have the records have amended with the specialist's office has been submitted. DOC staff are aware of the name alert.	Assistance Provided
65.	Patient reports that the results of recent CT scan confirm a	The OCO provided assistance by contacting the Facility Medical Director and requesting the	Assistance Provided

	concern the patient had brought to the attention of health services staff in the past. Testing was performed but the patient feels the test was inadequate and that his provider was not taking his concerns seriously.	patient's case be reviewed for further action. As a result, an outside specialist consult has been placed.	
66.	Patient was sent to Monroe for medical care but is not receiving the treatment that he needs.	The OCO provided assistance by requesting that the facility medical director (FMD) review the patient's case. The FMD's review resulted in the DOC scheduling surgery for this patient.	Assistance Provided
67.	Requested new eye examine and glasses, having difficulty seeing with current lenses. He kited medical. Since last examine was less than a year ago he will have to pay for an exam. However, the form they gave him says his last exam was in 2019. It has been more than two years since he received his last pair of glasses and exam not less than a year.	DOC staff resolved complaint prior to any OCO action. Incarcerated individual was scheduled to be seen by optometrist prior to any OCO action.	DOC Resolved
68.	Person says they only have vision in their right eye which now has glaucoma. For several years they have attempted to get a new pair of glasses, however, having only one optometrist for all the prison facilities has caused significant delays in eyecare. Person has also not been able to get a magnifying glass to read with.	DOC staff resolved complaint prior to any OCO action. Incarcerated individual is scheduled to see optometrist in 90 days.	DOC Resolved
69.	The facility is performing rapid tests past the time that this individual goes to work. The result is that they are losing wages because they continually show up late. They want staff to test them earlier so that they can go to work in the kitchen on time.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO contacted the DOC about this concern. The DOC reported that incarcerated individuals do not lose pay when they are waiting to be tested for work; their hours include the time spent waiting for rapid test results. Also, more staff were trained to perform tests and the correctional unit supervisor was asked to explore options to ease the process. At this point, kitchen workers are no longer checked daily for COVID since they are not on quarantine status. This office wrote this person a letter with this information.	DOC Resolved
70.	The incarcerated individual has had issues with the law library. He was written up for	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The incarcerated individual requested that this office close his	DOC Resolved

threatening the law librarian and he reports someone else wrote the kite. The law librarian is not sending his stuff out and is not answering his kites or kiosk messages. This person is concerned that DOC is delaying his infraction hearing which will cause him delays with his case.

concern because the DOC has dismissed his infraction.

71.	The incarcerated individual reports that he is in the intensive management unit and is not being transferred. The incarcerated individual also reports that he should be in minimum custody and is being housed incorrectly. This person has been kiting his counselor and other staff but is not getting any answers.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO contacted the DOC about this concern. The DOC reported that this person had their parole revoked and is awaiting transport out of the intensive management unit (IMU). The OCO verified that this person has been moved out of IMU and is now at another part of the facility. This office wrote this person a letter with their current release date.	DOC Resolved
72.	Family member number four of an incarcerated individual reports that DOC has decided to transfer him to Washington State Penitentiary (WSP.) This creates a hardship for his family to be able to visit him and have meaningful family contact. Family members would like for him to be moved closer to where they live.	The OCO reviewed the transfer plans and see that a new plan is being created by DOC staff. Currently, this plan has the individual staying on the west side of the state at his current facility. The plans are not finalized, so the OCO provided self-advocacy information about how to address any concerns with the final plans DOC creates and implements. The incarcerated individual can appeal this decision through the classification appeal process.	Information Provided
73.	Family member number three of an incarcerated individual reports that DOC has decided to transfer him to Washington State Penitentiary (WSP.) This creates a hardship for his family to be able to visit him and have meaningful family contact. Family members would like for him to be moved closer to where they live.	The OCO reviewed the transfer plans and see that a new plan is being created by DOC staff. Currently, this plan has the individual staying on the west side of the state at his current facility. The plans are not finalized, so the OCO provided self-advocacy information about how to address any concerns with the final plans DOC creates and implements. The incarcerated individual can appeal this decision through the classification appeal process.	Information Provided
74.	Family member number two of an incarcerated individual reports that DOC has decided to transfer him to Washington State Penitentiary (WSP.) This creates a hardship for his family to be able to visit him and have meaningful family contact. Family members would like for	The OCO reviewed the transfer plans and see that a new plan is being created by DOC staff. Currently, this plan has the individual staying on the west side of the state at his current facility. The plans are not finalized, so the OCO provided self-advocacy information about how to address any concerns with the final plans DOC creates and implements. The incarcerated individual can appeal this decision through the classification appeal process.	Information Provided

	him to be moved closer to where they live.		
75.	Family member number one of an incarcerated individual reports that DOC has decided to transfer him to Washington State Penitentiary (WSP.) This creates a hardship for his family to be able to visit him and have meaningful family contact. Family members would like for him to be moved closer to where they live.	The OCO reviewed the transfer plans and see that a new plan is being created by DOC staff. Currently, this plan has the individual staying on the west side of the state at his current facility. The plans are not finalized, so the OCO provided self-advocacy information about how to address any concerns with the final plans DOC creates and implements. The incarcerated individual can appeal this decision through the classification appeal process.	Information Provided
76.	Patient's current treatment with over-the-counter medications and physical therapy is not working to ease his chronic pain. He feels DOC is ignoring him.	The OCO provided self-advocacy information regarding the Care Review Committee and appeal process.	Information Provided
77.	Incarcerated patient states he is not receiving appropriate care for his chronic pain.	The OCO provided self-advocacy information regarding the Care Review Committee appeal process and other potential legal remedies.	Information Provided
78.	Patient is experiencing chronic pain and has requested an x-ray and MRI but was sent to the physical therapist instead. The physical therapist recommended he speak with his provider.	The OCO provided information to the individual about the plan of care that has been created by the facility medical director and provider team.	Information Provided
79.	Incarcerated person fears for his safety due to a facility plan recommendation. He requested information about who to contact at headquarters for classification and STG issues.	The OCO provided information regarding DOC HQ contact.	Information Provided
80.	Individual reports several concerns, including accessing mental health services for active symptoms, receiving results of HIV test, medication and medication side effects.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. This office reviewed this person's mental health and medical records as well as their recent resolution requests. The OCO determined that they are receiving mental health services. The OCO could not substantiate that the DOC is ignoring their requests or denying them access to their test results. This office wrote this person a letter with this information.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
81.	The incarcerated individual reports that staff have implemented a new rule regarding how incarcerated	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO contacted the DOC about this concern. The DOC reported that this is not a new rule and all incarcerated	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate

	<p>individuals store property boxes in their cells. Staff members are saying that it is a fire hazard and property must be stored in the lockers; any extra items will be thrown away. Other incarcerated individuals are getting infracted if they cannot fit their belongings in the lockers and it is primarily impacting people who have been incarcerated for a long time.</p>	<p>individuals have cell standards that they are expected to maintain. Any excess property must be shipped out, picked up, or placed in property storage. The DOC does not require any incarcerated individuals to throw away property. This office wrote this person a letter with this information.</p>	
82.	<p>The incarcerated individual wants to know how to request evidence that will be presented for his infraction hearing. He has requested a kite from DOC but says they will not give it to him. He is being accused of writing a kite that he did not write to an officer and he is receiving an infraction for it, and he wants to prove that he did not do it.</p>	<p>The OCO investigated the individual's infractions and was unable to substantiate that he has any pending infractions regarding this matter.</p>	<p>Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate</p>
83.	<p>Family reports their vehicle was parked in a DOC parking lot and while with her loved one during an Extended Family Visit, her car was taken and later returned to the parking lot.</p>	<p>The OCO lacks jurisdiction to investigate this complaint because the complaint does not involve a person committed to the physical custody of the DOC.</p>	<p>Lacked Jurisdiction</p>
84.	<p>Person was revoked from Community Custody for absconding and failing to comply with the Electronic Home Monitoring agreement due to a circumstance that was out of their control and person does not think the hearing was fair to the situation.</p>	<p>The OCO was unable to investigate or provide assistance. The complaint relates to an issue that is not under OCO jurisdiction. The OCO lacks jurisdiction over Community Custody concerns.</p>	<p>Lacked Jurisdiction</p>
85.	<p>The person reports being returned to total confinement to serve the remainder of their sentence because of violations while on community custody. They just found out that DOC is considering administering a psychological evaluation on them with the possibility of civil commitment. Person says they</p>	<p>DOC is referring the individual for a Psychological Evaluation under RCW 71.09 for possible civil commitment. The OCO lacks jurisdiction over complaints regarding the civil commitment process. The OCO's jurisdiction extends only to actions or inactions of the DOC; it is the superior court in the county of conviction that has authority to determine if the person meets the definition of "sexually violation predator" which would result in civil commitment.</p>	<p>Lacked Jurisdiction</p>

have not done anything to make the evaluation necessary and does not want to be civilly committed.

86.	Incarcerated individual reports that their JPay tablet's battery stopped working. They were told that the tablet had been discontinued and they could not receive a new one, and their warranty had expired. This person had purchased \$8,000 worth of media over the past decade. They requested a refund from JPay if they could not get a new tablet and they were offered \$75 total. The individual would like a replacement tablet considering another incarcerated individual requested a replacement for the same type of tablet and received a new one.	The OCO lacks jurisdiction to investigate this complaint because the complaint relates to an action taken by an agency other than the Washington State Department of Corrections.	Lacked Jurisdiction
87.	An incarcerated individual reached out due to a memo released by his facility that caused concern. Some of the issues were the lack of adequate legal storage like plastic containers and possible consequences for window coverings to block the excessive sunlight. Due to recent discoveries of pruno and pruno-making material, staff will implement increased searches limiting the population to one piece of fruit in their cell at a time that has to be consumed before the next meal time.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate a violation of DOC's policy. The OCO was informed by DOC staff that although the plastic containers for storage are not available, there are other options for storage available. The incarcerated person can order specific storage items through Correctional Industries (CI) or request the Superintendent's permission to store legal work in the property room. Page seven of the facility handbook addresses window coverings; "When the outside temperature is 75 degrees or higher, and the sun is shining directly on the windows; half of the outside window may be covered with state issue sheets, cotton blankets, or towels without altering." The increased pruno checks are not a violation of policy 420.320, which states, "staff has the ability to search cells randomly and frequently." The facility handbook allows for one piece of fruit at a time in the cell, but incarcerated individuals can request authorization for additional snacks through health services.	No Violation of Policy
88.	The incarcerated individual reports that he was approved for school courses but has not received his books. He received a rejection from the mailroom, but mailroom staff will not	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The mailroom rejected this person's books because they were used and not purchased through the proper vendor. This decision is within policy. This office provided information regarding the appeal process to the individual.	No Violation of Policy

disclose the reason and did not explain the appeal process.

89.	Patient uses a walker and wheelchair and has a history of falls with injury. He feels he would be safer in a single ADA cell.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. Per DOC policy 420.140, a single cell assignment for medical reasons must be recommended by the Chief Medical Officer or designee and approved by the Headquarters Community Screening Committee. The OCO requested the Facility Medical Director (FMD) review the patient's case; the FMD informed this office that this patient does not currently qualify for a medical recommendation for a single cell.	No Violation of Policy
90.	Person states they were not afforded due process in their resolution request. While housed in the COA the individual's conditions of confinement made writing tools inaccessible and he was unable to appeal his resolution request.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO contacted the DOC resolutions specialist and Health Services manager. It is within policy for DOC medical to order conditions of confinement while an individual is housed within the COA. The individual may request to dictate an appeal to a staff member for documentation. Neither the Resolutions Program nor Health Services have received a request to appeal following his release from COA.	No Violation of Policy
91.	This incarcerated individual reports that they were taken out of Construction Trades Apprenticeship Preparation program before they received an infraction. They reported that they were taken out of the class in March but did not receive the infraction until April.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO contacted the DOC about this concern. The DOC reported that the incarcerated individual lost their gate card when they received the infraction, and after the infraction, they were dropped from the Construction Trades Apprenticeship Preparation program. The records for this incarcerated individual confirmed the DOC's statement. This office wrote this person a letter with this information.	No Violation of Policy
92.	The incarcerated individual's computer did not work on the first day of school, his teacher instructed him to do his assignments by hand but did not provide supplies. After a few weeks, the computer was not fixed, so he asked DOC to drop him from the class. He was told he would be infractioned if he dropped the class. This person also reports discrimination and racial bias based on immigration status because he was rejected for the GED program due to his immigration status.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO contacted the DOC about this concern and they verified that this person was allowed to drop the class without an infraction. This office also reviewed the Education and Vocational Program in Prisons policy which states that incarcerated individuals subject to deportation may only participate in post-secondary education programs which do not include the GED program. The OCO wrote this person a letter citing the policy and verified infraction history.	No Violation of Policy

93.	Incarcerated individual reported that DOC staff hot trashed their religious food items and infringed them. The food was for a religious celebration. Person says that other ethnicities did not get their food hot trashed for sharing and this is a racist behavior because they are Muslim.	The OCO reviewed the infraction and found there is evidence to substantiate the infraction as the individual admitted to giving another individual a bag of food. Although the food was for religious purposes, it is within policy for DOC to issue an infraction to someone for giving or trading food. While technically in policy, the OCO flagged this complaint for the DOC as an occasion for the department to demonstrate improved for cultural competence.	No Violation of Policy
94.	Incarcerated person says that they were infringed and pled not guilty on both charges, providing his statement and witness statements. Person says the hearings officer then made a statement that showed implicit bias, indicating that they were not given a fair hearing.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO reviewed the available disciplinary record for this infraction. The audio recording did not contain any statements that confirmed bias on the part of the hearing officer; if those statements were made while the recording was paused for deliberation, the OCO cannot verify whether they were made. The infraction was supported by sufficient evidence to meet DOC's low evidence standard. The incarcerated person's appeal was accepted, deliberated, and finalized according to policy.	No Violation of Policy
95.	Incarcerated individual was moved from ADA cell and has limited mobility in current, non-ADA cell. Person reports having an active health status report for a wheelchair.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO received communication from the Facility Medical Director, Health Services Manager, and ADA coordinator. This person was initially moved due to a plumbing issue in the cell.	No Violation of Policy
96.	The incarcerated Individual reports concerns that the DOC failed to identify that Governor's vaccination proclamation included incarcerated workers. The individual alleged that the DOC did not appropriately notify workers about vaccine mandates so they could comply, resulting in termination and loss of pay for months.	The OCO was able to substantiate this concern but was not able to achieve a resolution. The OCO reviewed the memo clarifying that incarcerated workers who work for or at other state agencies needed to comply with the mandate by October 18, 2021. The directive was provided on October 20, 2021, two days after the proclamation compliance date, resulting in temporary work and pay loss. The complainant requested compensation for this loss. The OCO cannot provide compensation but provided information on how to file a tort claim.	Substantiated Without Resolution
97.	Patient was given medication that was not ordered for him, resulting in a medical emergency. The patient reports now having difficulty utilizing health services due to fear and mistrust.	The OCO was able to substantiate this concern but was not able to achieve a resolution. The OCO contacted Health Services management who substantiated the incident. The patient has since moved to a different facility and is currently receiving care. Additional concerns about current	Substantiated Without Resolution

health care are being addressed in a separate OCO case.

Olympic Corrections Center			
98.	The incarcerated individual reports that they were approved to transfer to another facility at their last custody review. However, headquarters denied the transfer and did not provide a reason for the decision. This person is trying to transfer to another facility on the west side of the state to be closer to family and have access to an Educational Navigator as they transition from prison to college.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
99.	Person is being denied Graduated Reentry. Counselor says that he is not eligible for GRE despite being previously approved by different counselor. Has appealed but is getting vague answers and earned release date is only a few months away. Wants to go to work release if GRE is denied.	The OCO provided information regarding the reason for denial of work release. There is a community concern locally therefore person cannot go to GRE. Advocate to counselor and ask to be screened to the next two counties over.	Information Provided
100.	A loved one reported that a staff member sexually harassed an incarcerated individual during a pat search. The incarcerated individual asked to be searched by another staff member but was told no and that if he did not comply he would go to segregation. This person feels uncomfortable with this particular staff member, so they filed a PREA complaint.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. This office requested the PREA investigation and reviewed the information provided. The OCO contacted the DOC about this concern and was told that the officer followed the procedure and that incarcerated individuals are not allowed to request alternative staff members for pat down searches. This office wrote this person a letter with this information.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
101.	The incarcerated person is challenging a DOC policy regarding DNA testing unless by court order, as it would benefit the population and their families. He would like assistance in changing this policy.	The OCO could not identify evidence to substantiate a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO review determined DOC is following procedure by only allowing DNA testing under court-ordered and sentencing conditions. The DOC is currently following the DNA Samples policy 310.610, WAC 446-75-060, and RCW 43.43.754. The OCO informed the complainant that the legislature	No Violation of Policy

decides the DNA utilization, and the change would need to take place via the same route.

Other			
102.	The incarcerated individual reports they are concerned that their right to a speedy trial is being violated. The person is requesting representation from the OCO.	The OCO lacks jurisdiction to investigate this complaint because the complaint relates to an action taken by an agency other than the Washington State Department of Corrections.	Lacked Jurisdiction
103.	The incarcerated individual reports general issues regarding confinement, such as time out of their cells and access to a haircut and shave. He reports issues with accessing outside support while held in jail.	The OCO lacks jurisdiction to investigate this complaint because the complaint does not involve a person committed to the physical custody of the DOC.	Lacked Jurisdiction
104.	Person states that they are no longer in custody. They were released to a clean and sober house that is not a good environment. Person says that the people are using drugs and there are drug paraphernalia everywhere. Person attempted to seek approval for an alternate clean and sober house in a different county but their Community Custody Officer did not approve the change of address and person is worried they will relapse and be returned to prison.	The OCO was unable to investigate this concern because the complaint relates to an issue that is not under OCO jurisdiction. The OCO lacks jurisdiction over Community Custody concerns. The OCO did provide self-advocacy information for the Community Supervision division at the DOC Headquarters where this individual may address their concern.	Lacked Jurisdiction
Stafford Creek Corrections Center			
105.	The incarcerated individual reports that this is the tenth day in a row DOC staff have put his unit last to get food from the chow hall. This means that they often do not get food until later in the morning or evening.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
106.	Individual has questions regarding education options. He wants to use FAFSA for Correspondence College or a grant and was told that is not an option.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
107.	The person reports being given a pillowcase that was in the form of a Ku Klux Klan hood	The OCO provided self-advocacy information related to RCW 43.06C which requires that the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued

	during sheet exchange. He has filed a grievance, but it was returned as a rewrite.	resolve a concern through the grievance process, administrative actions, and/or an appellate process or if more than 90 days have passed since filing the grievance before the OCO may investigate the case.	
108.	The incarcerated individual reports that they were forced to sign a waiver allowing staff to E-file their legal documents without their presence. This person did not want to sign this waiver but did so because the court matter was urgent. The person attempted to resolve this concern with the custody unit supervisor who the person says was confrontational and unprofessional, siding with the staff member who refused them legal access by forcing them to sign the waiver.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
109.	Incarcerated individual reports that Corrections Officers are using food as punishment. When he was walking to dining hall CO's made him go back for not wearing a mask, and would not allow him food. This is noted in the behavior log he received. Reports that DOC violated law by not feeding him a lunch meal.	The OCO provided self-advocacy information related to RCW 43.06C which requires that the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve a concern through the grievance process, administrative actions, and/or an appellate process or if more than 90 days have passed since filing the grievance before the OCO may investigate the case.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
110.	Person reports testing positive for COVID-19 and being medically fragile and high risk. He would like to receive the COVID medication but has not received a response to his weekend kites.	The OCO provided assistance by contacting Health Services management, resulting in the patient being assessed by the COVID team and treated quickly.	Assistance Provided
111.	The incarcerated person is requesting that OCO provide them with information on the Amend Project as they have not gotten any details yet.	The OCO achieved a resolution of the person's complaint. The OCO provided assistance to the complainant by relaying the concern and requesting information be provided. The DOC staff created an Amend program overview to send the population via kiosk and unit postings.	Assistance Provided
112.	Patient states they are being denied care. The emergency resolution request was denied because he had a follow up appointment already	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The patient has been seen at sick call and by his provider, received the imaging requested, and a consult for outside care has been placed.	DOC Resolved

scheduled. He was also supposed to have an MRI done.

113.	The individual has an HSR for a new mattress. The individual thinks that they are being lied to about being placed on a list.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The individual contacted the OCO and informed our office he had received his mattress.	DOC Resolved
114.	Individual reports filing a grievance over two weeks ago and has not received a grievance log ID number or DOC response. The individual is concerned that the grievance response is overdue. This person's grievance relates to the mental health programming location at this facility.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO reviewed this person's records and found the grievance ID associated with this concern. This office wrote this person a letter with the ID number and the response that had been given to them from the DOC.	DOC Resolved
115.	Patient reports several medications were discontinued abruptly without notification or meeting with prescriber.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The patient called this office and relayed he had received his medications.	DOC Resolved
116.	Incarcerated individual states he has significant injuries and is not receiving proper medical attention. Has not been given his X-ray results and nothing is being done but is told he needs immediate surgery. Has grieved this concern twice, first one was an emergency, second grievance has not been answered yet. This concern has been going on for two years.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO contacted the DOC and were informed that the patient had been seen in follow up to the kites and surgery is scheduled.	DOC Resolved
117.	Community member reports delayed meal times and poor conditions. Someone in the unit received insulin at 8am and did not receive food until much later in the day. Individual said there had been a recent death due to ineffective medical treatment of diabetes. Individual reports SCCC is on their fifth lockdown with COVID and says there is now tuberculosis in the facility and it is spreading. There are over 100 latent cases in one unit alone. SCCC keeps having outbreaks (where other facilities in the state have	The OCO met with DOC staff to address concerns regarding the May 2022 COVID outbreak. Incarcerated individuals are sheltering in place and staff is working to address the food issue. The OCO also provided self-advocacy information related to RCW 43.06C which requires that the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve a concern through the grievance process, administrative actions, and/or an appellate process or if more than 90 days have passed since filing the grievance before the OCO may investigate the case.	Information Provided

stopped) because staff who have worked with sick individuals are then allowed to work with healthy individuals. Individual says food is now delayed, frozen, or inedible.

118.	This incarcerated individual has health problems and is currently in the intensive management unit. He has been having many issues with one staff member who takes him to shower and out to the yard. The staff member left him in the shower for three hours. He has filed multiple grievances about her, including this incident. However, he has not received responses to any of his grievances.	The OCO provided information regarding the status of his grievances. This office informed him that OCO staff had discussed the matter with DOC staff to ensure that they were aware of the concern. The DOC scheduled a meeting with the individual and is using the internal resolution process to address this concern. This office wrote this person a letter with this information and encouraged them to pursue this issue to a level III grievance.	Information Provided
119.	The incarcerated population is not getting information regarding the status of COVID at the facility; the staff tells them they don't know anything. The size and quality of the meals have declined substantially since the facility implemented the shelter in place.	DOC implemented policies to address COVID-19 conditions within the facilities. The OCO was not able to determine the DOC actions in this case were outside of those implemented policies.	Information Provided
120.	Family reports that individual has had extreme pain and swelling in chest and face since having an upper wisdom tooth removed. He is also having trouble concentrating and sleeps a lot due to the amount of pain. He received an x-ray and showed bone chips where they removed the tooth but says that should not be causing this amount pain and swelling. He did receive an MRI but it had to be redone and this has not happened. Their family is concerned about the worsening infection.	The OCO provided self-advocacy information to complainant. Family member contacted OCO on their behalf, but confidentiality form had not been signed. OCO provided explanation of confidentiality and included confidentiality form in closing letter.	Information Provided
121.	The incarcerated person shared multiple concerns. They stated they are not receiving timely responses to their resolution requests. The person also	The OCO provided self-advocacy information to the individual. The OCO verified that the manual is available on the unit and informed the individual of the process for checking out the manual. The OCO also informed the individual that his resolution	Information Provided

stated they do not understand the denial reasons quoted in their resolution responses. This prevents them from adequately appealing denials because, allegedly, there is no resolution manual to refer to in the unit. They would like assistance getting the manual and a response to the resolution request about access to the manual.

request response was not overdue and to contact resolution staff if it was not received in a few weeks.

122.	The incarcerated person wants to file a tort claim through this office regarding a medical error.	The OCO provided self-advocacy information to the complainant. The OCO provided information regarding how to file a tort claim, including what to include and to submit the information to the Department of Enterprise Services (DES).	Information Provided
123.	Person is receiving conflicting information about graduated re-entry and out of state transfer. They want to know if they can do GRE out of state, and would like to know if housing voucher program will work out of state.	The OCO provided information regarding the out of state transfer and vouchers being used on GRE. The OCO explained that the GRE policy does not permit out of state transfer, and further explained if a person decides to change their plan while on GRE they could be sent back to full confinement.	Information Provided
124.	Incarcerated individual reports he has not received his stimulus check from the Internal Revenue Service (IRS).	The OCO provided information regarding how to contact the IRS to request further information about the status of his stimulus check(s). The OCO also confirmed that the individual has received two stimulus checks.	Information Provided
125.	Incarcerated individual received a serious infraction for refusing to disburse, which they say is the latest in a string of discriminatory actions taken by the infracting officer. Incarcerated person states the officer has repeatedly discriminated against them because of their sentence. Reported discrimination included encouraging other incarcerated people to be violent toward this person; issuing bunk infractions; and making inappropriate statements to the person. Incarcerated person asked to overturn the infraction, but also to investigate the staff member in question.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO requested and reviewed the infraction materials, as well as all of the communications the incarcerated person had made regarding the staff member. The infraction was supported by sufficient evidence to meet the DOC's low evidence standard. The OCO requested DOC administration to review the communications in their entirety, to discern whether grounds exist for staff discipline. The individual made a number of statements, but there was no additional evidence--audio, video, witness statements, or otherwise--that would back up the person's claims. Based solely on the incarcerated person's statements, there is not sufficient evidence to establish a pattern of discriminatory behavior on the part of the staff member.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate

126.	Patient reports his health status report was ordered but items are not being issued by nurses. He was told to see his provider, but he is not being scheduled because a nursing assistant is intercepting medical kites and making decisions.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO contacted the DOC and was informed that the patient had been given copies of his health status reports and the durable medical equipment for which the patient currently has orders. The OCO is unable to substantiate claims of medical staff inappropriately intercepting kites.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
127.	Person says their access to medical and mental health care is limited.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO contacted the DOC and verified the patient has been seen by both medical and mental health recently.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
128.	The person reports that he has a brother, and some of his brother's information has been wrongly transferred into his file. This person has reviewed court documents from his brother's old cases and some of his brother's charges have been put in his history. He tried to show the documents to the ISRB and they were not willing to look at them. This person is not contesting the decision from the ISRB Board, he wants someone to help him get the incorrect charges out of his file.	Per RCW 43.06C.040(2)(e), the OCO lacks jurisdiction to investigate this complaint because the complaint relates to the person's underlying criminal conviction. If the sentence information on file is incorrect, he will need to file a motion with the courts. An attorney specializing in criminal convictions would have more information about the next steps regarding this concern.	Lacked Jurisdiction
129.	Patient states the DOC is not following specialist's recommendations to get him to a pain management clinic, which has been authorized for a year. His last scheduled appointment was cancelled and has not been rescheduled. Patient says staff ended a long-term health status report (HSR) that he needs renewed. He would also like to have a single cell.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The HSR was renewed prior to OCO involvement. The patient is seen regularly by medical providers and his outside specialist. The outside appointment in question is delayed because the specialist is not currently accepting appointments. The patient must request a single cell recommendation from the Facility Medical Director.	No Violation of Policy
130.	The incarcerated individual received a letter saying that he was eligible for graduated reentry. However, when he spoke to his counselor about it, the counselor said the letter was a mistake and that he is not eligible for graduated reentry planning.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO contacted the DOC about this concern. The DOC reported that this person is not eligible for graduated reentry because there are certain criteria that this person does not meet.	No Violation of Policy

131.	Incarcerated person reports that that they were approved for their therapy aide and had not received one.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO review determined that the individual was unable to identify an appropriate and willing person to act as therapy aide. When DOC staff indicated that they would assign an aide to him, individual declined to have an assigned therapy aide.	No Violation of Policy
132.	The incarcerated person stated they have been under I&I investigation and it has been over 90 days. He states that his family members' numbers have been blocked. He is requesting the numbers be unblocked so he can communicate with his family.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO reviewed available documentation and spoke with a facility Investigation team member. The team member provided information that the complainant was violating the conditions of their Judgment and Sentence during some calls resulting in the investigation and the phone numbers being temporarily blocked. The investigation was concluded, and the phone numbers were removed from the block list. The DOC informed the complainant that any further violation would result in further disciplinary actions.	No Violation of Policy
133.	Patient reports that the Veteran's Administration had planned surgery prior to his incarceration to address a chronic health problem. He reports that DOC has scheduled appointments but not a surgery consult.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO reviewed medical records and could not substantiate that an order for surgery had occurred. The OCO determined that DOC is acting within the guidelines set forth by the Health Plan by providing treatment alternatives.	No Violation of Policy
134.	The incarcerated person received a custody promotion and has been waiting months to transfer.	The OCO was able to substantiate this concern but was not able to achieve a resolution. The OCO was able to verify an approved transfer order for this individual. The OCO's review determined that, due to COVID 19 mitigation efforts, transfers between facilities had been delayed. Transfers have resumed and the transfer order is active for this individual, but the DOC is waiting for appropriate transport from his facility to the receiving facility to be available.	Substantiated Without Resolution
135.	The person received a legal financial obligation (LFO) refund for two causes, and DOC took deductions out of them. This was an error, and Inmate Banking fixed one cause number but not the amount on the other cause number. This person is expecting to receive another refund from DOC.	The OCO was able to substantiate this concern, but was not able to achieve a resolution. The OCO contacted the DOC about this concern. The DOC reported that they initially made an error while calculating deductions from this person's refund and had returned a portion of the funds to this person's account. The portion that was not returned was because DOC had already applied it to a separate outstanding LFO and this action cannot be reversed.	Substantiated Without Resolution

136.	A family member called with concerns regarding their loved one, who will release soon, being harassed by a staff member he has had issues with in the past. The person reported this as retaliation and stated his son had received eight infractions in two days.	The incarcerated person has not pursued an internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance or administrative or appellate process. The OCO could not locate an appeal of the infraction nor a resolution request regarding staff misconduct.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
137.	The incarcerated person reports being in medical isolation for seven days and today is the first day they have been tested in 10 days. They feel like they are being punished for having COVID. Their mail was rejected because the facility said they are in receiving, but they are not in receiving. The individual also requested additional information regarding DOC infraction policy.	Per DOC protocols, medical isolation for COVID is 14 days at minimum. The OCO provided self-advocacy information related to RCW 43.06C which requires that the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve a concern through the grievance process, administrative actions, and/or an appellate process or if more than 90 days have passed since filing the grievance before the OCO may investigate the case. This office also included DOC 460.140 Hearings and Appeals regarding infractions under DOC.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
138.	The incarcerated individual expressed concerns about the conditions of quarantine and staff not properly wearing Personal Protective Equipment at the facility. The individual only received fresh air once for 10 minutes in a 46 day period because of the amount of time spent in quarantine while transferring facilities.	The OCO provided self-advocacy information related to RCW 43.06C which requires that the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve a concern through the grievance process, administrative actions, and/or an appellate process or if more than 90 days have passed since filing the grievance before the OCO may investigate the case.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
139.	The incarcerated individual reports that the facility is not allowing her pajamas or supportive bras.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
140.	The incarcerated individual has not received their property since he transferred from WCC to SCCC. The individual also reported that the DOC had given no response to his communications regarding the matter.	The incarcerated person has not pursued an internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process. The OCO cannot locate lost property or provide reimbursement; the office provided information about what actions to take to reasonably resolve.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued

141.	<p>This complainant is a Muslim. He reports that when he came on the chain to DOC from county jail, DOC took his personal kufi because they stated that it was county property when it was his personal property. DOC said they would provide him one and never did. He doesn't have access to a Quran, and loved ones are not allowed to send one in. DOC served a pork product (in Lucky Charms) and they will not allow anyone else to sign up to be part of Ramadan. They asked him to file a grievance on the Ramadan issue but Ramadan will be finished by the time it moves through the grievance process. DOC staff told him there are no exceptions.</p>	<p>DOC staff resolved complaint prior to any OCO action. The OCO was informed by DOC staff that DOC will no longer serve Lucky Charms to individuals observing Muslim dietary restrictions.</p>	DOC Resolved
142.	<p>Incarcerated individual reports that while he was housed at WCC, DOC staff would not issue him his CPAP machine. This could cause serious health issues or even cause him to die. He has received the machine since being transferred to CRCC but wants the OCO to ensure that this never happens to anyone else.</p>	<p>DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint, as documented via level 0 informally resolved grievance.</p>	DOC Resolved
143.	<p>The incarcerated individual is being sent to a facility where another person is currently housed at that they testified against. The individual says they made numerous attempts to communicate this to multiple staff members but their unit counselor put their life in danger by ignoring that pertinent information and when they did get to speak with the counselor, they misinformed him that it would be taken care of and also misinformed other staff about the seriousness of the issue.</p>	<p>The OCO provided the incarcerated individual information regarding him being housed in a separate unit from the other individual, which is on file.</p>	Information Provided

144.	Patient states that he is experiencing concerning symptoms that are not being addressed by medical. He states he has sent in several kites and resolution requests about the issue and was told if he continued to file resolution requests he would be infracted.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO contacted the DOC and was informed that the patient had been sent to the outside specialist and a treatment plan had been made with the patient to mitigate his symptoms. The OCO was not able to find evidence of threats made to the patient but did address the claim with Health Services management.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
145.	Person reports that a nurse grabbed him through the cell bars and verbally assaulted him during medication administration.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The unit camera footage is currently unavailable due to the Resolutions office being remodeled. The OCO communicated to the individual that this office could reopen the investigation when the video evidence becomes available.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
146.	A family member shared concerns that those housed in the Enhanced Close Custody Unit at Washington Corrections Center are not given access to JPay services like video visits and email. The incarcerated persons housed there can have their JPay tablet but lack connectivity for services. They are requesting the installation of a JPay kiosk.	The OCO was able to substantiate this concern but was not able to achieve a resolution. The OCO contacted DOC staff, who reported they had previously requested installing a kiosk in that unit. JPay denied the request on the basis that there needs to be a higher consistent number of people housed in the unit to make installing a kiosk financially feasible. Unit staff informed this office that they have already altered the movement to allow for travel to an alternate unit for the purpose of syncing JPay tablets. It does not allow for email, visits, or messaging, but the incarcerated population can have music media. DOC staff indicated they will maintain the altered movement.	Substantiated Without Resolution
147.	Patient was taken off all of their medications when they arrived at this facility. They sent medical kites and put in a grievance, but the provider will not resolve or answer their complaints.	The OCO was able to substantiate this concern but was not able to achieve a resolution. The OCO contacted the DOC and substantiated a delay in the ordering of medications for this patient. The patient has transferred to a new facility and current medical care is being addressed by the OCO in a separate complaint.	Substantiated Without Resolution
148.	This person is trying to get approved for extended family visits (EFVs) with their incarcerated husband but DOC has denied their application. DOC cited the husband's past domestic violence charge as the reasoning. This person says the charge was dismissed and they want to know if visitation can deny them for a dismissed charge.	The OCO was able to substantiate this concern, but was not able to achieve a resolution. The OCO's review determined that the DOC staff may rely on any past indicators of violence which is the reason for this denial. The office communicated to this person that extended family visits can be denied for charges that were dismissed. This office wrote the incarcerated person a letter with the same information that was provided for his wife.	Substantiated Without Resolution

149.	Patient says that they are challenging Department of Correction's Medically Assisted Treatment (MAT) policy. Patient was on the MAT program prior to transferring to Washington Corrections Center. However, the facility is telling them they do not meet the criteria based on release date.	The OCO was able to substantiate this concern but was not able to achieve a resolution. The OCO contacted the DOC and discussed the medication assisted therapy (MAT) protocol. Currently Washington Corrections Center is not able to provide MAT to eligible patients with more than six months remaining in custody. This person will be provided with resources to start the program upon release, per protocol.	Substantiated Without Resolution
------	--	--	----------------------------------

Washington Corrections Center for Women

150.	Person reported concerns with HIPPA violations. Person was trying to get into sick call. Nurse came to her unit to do the appointment in the main area with other people in unit present. Person asked the nurse for more privacy and she was told the appointment would occur in the unit. She feels her privacy was not considered for a medical appointment.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
151.	The incarcerated person shared concerns regarding an intimidating nurse who was not performing in a trauma-informed, gender-responsive way.	The incarcerated person has not pursued an internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process. The OCO could not locate a resolution request regarding this matter.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
152.	The incarcerated individual reports that the accounting department is incorrectly taking 75% of her money when it should be 15% and her LFOs are paid off	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
153.	Person reports that the sergeant ordered the officers to take the individual's legal papers because she refused to sign an employment contract. Person has an active legal case.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
154.	The incarcerated individual reports that a DOC staff member shut her foot in the door.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued

155.	<p>Caller reports that she agreed to a behavior plan to go to general population, with stipulations. Since being in general population, she's been in and out of the close observation unit (COA). She later decided that she would like to return to the residential treatment unit ("TEC" at WCCW) because she does not feel ready for general population. However, the mental health provider told her that is not an option. She wants to feel supported and have her mental health needs met.</p>	<p>DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. Person has not been moved to general population. Person still remains in the TEC unit. Encouraged person to continue to access mental health resources.</p>	<p>DOC Resolved</p>
156.	<p>Patient is suffering effects of PTSD related to job placement. She has tried to explain this to mental health, custody and kitchen staff. She is being threatened with an infraction and demotion due to this. Staff is not doing anything to try to help her.</p>	<p>DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO's review determined that the person had begun receiving mental health services as desired and that the job placement was going well.</p>	<p>DOC Resolved</p>
157.	<p>The incarcerated individual expressed concerns about their supervisor's ethical behavior in the Prison Pet Partnership Program. The individual is in fear of termination if they speak up about how the supervisor's behavior is having a negative impact on their ability to learn from this program.</p>	<p>The OCO lacks jurisdiction to investigate this complaint because the complaint relates to an action taken by an agency other than the Washington State Department of Corrections.</p>	<p>Lacked Jurisdiction</p>
158.	<p>Person has been in Ad-seg for over 30 days and they should have had a hearing by now. Person has appealed this issue but has not been responded to.</p>	<p>The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO review noted that DOC is within the guidelines. DOC is within parameters of administrative segregation policy DOC 320.200.</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy</p>
159.	<p>Person reports that they were terminated from the Prison Pet Partnership program (PPP) unfairly. Person reports poor management in the PPP program, resulting in tensions between staff and employees.</p>	<p>The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. OCO review determined that person was not terminated from the program; person was administratively removed temporarily and was told they could apply again in six to 12 months.</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy</p>
160.	<p>Person was infraacted and is facing loss in custody points.</p>	<p>The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC.</p>	<p>No Violation of Policy</p>

	Person alleges violation of DOC 300.388.	Person was not infracted and housing placement remains in medium security.	
161.	The external family member reports that the incarcerated individual was diagnosed with stage four cancer which got to that point because of the DOC delaying medical attention, The current issue is that staff are threatening individuals in the unit that if they tested positive for COVID, they would be put in isolation/confinement which would create issues with her cancer treatment.	The incarcerated individual did not respond to the OCO's request to provide additional information within 30 days. The OCO encouraged this person to contact this office if they would like to request assistance.	Person Declined OCO Involvement

Washington State Penitentiary

162.	The incarcerated individual reports that only the trustees in the Intensive Management Unit received new mattresses and his mattress is still old. DOC has not replaced them yet like they stated they would in a previous OCO report.	The OCO provided self-advocacy information related to RCW 43.06C which requires that the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve a concern through the grievance process, administrative actions, and/or an appellate process or if more than 90 days have passed since filing the grievance before the OCO may investigate the case. He can kite his CUS for a new mattress or file a grievance.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
163.	The incarcerated individual reports that DOC is canceling their time outside in the yard and the incarcerated population has not been outside for over a week. The facility also has been serving poor food including the breakfast boats and the cable has been out for three weeks.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
164.	The incarcerated individual reports being infracted for saying to a correctional officer that "he did not trust white people" in the context of requesting a policy number that she refused to give him. He was then infracted with an 896 for abusive language and harassment. He was not allowed to present his evidence at the hearing because his property and papers were missing or being forwarded internally. He was found guilty,	The OCO provided self-advocacy information related to RCW 43.06C which requires that the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve a concern through the grievance process, administrative actions, and/or an appellate process. An infraction appeal is required for the OCO to open an investigation.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued

is appealing infraction, and is supposed to release in June.

165.	The incarcerated individual requested help completing a resolution request for the medical department. The staff member did not finish helping them fill out the request and then handed it to the medical staff instead of giving it to the resolution department. The incarcerated individual got frustrated and punched the wall. The medical staff are now not communicating a treatment plan for his hand that needed stitches.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
166.	Person reports they have not received a mental health evaluation and would like one.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
167.	The incarcerated individual reports that he is missing some of his property that was packed up six months ago. He reports he did not receive a notice of property that was inventoried nor rejection and mail notices. He reports he can no longer buy an adaptor or power cord from the vendor and cannot use his keyboard without them.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
168.	Incarcerated individual states they were placed into the IMU and has not received their property back.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
169.	The incarcerated individual was supposed to be in the graduated reentry program (GRE) track II. He has been told that he will not be going to electric home monitoring (EHM) in the coming months because of his conviction. DOC is using that conviction as the basis to not allow him to go on EHM (track II). Instead, he will	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued

be going to work release at the beginning of next year, and he must apply at that time for placement at work release facility.

170.	The incarcerated person shared concerns that his property was stored in long-term storage and is missing because it did not arrive with him when he transferred. He is concerned as his purchase receipts for items are in the missing property.	The incarcerated individual must pursue internal resolution per RCW 43.06C.040(2)(b) before the OCO is able to investigate the case. The incarcerated person has not pursued an internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process. The OCO does not have the ability to locate lost property or provide reimbursement. The OCO provided information regarding attempting to resolve this concern via the resolution program to attempt to find the items and the tort process for reimbursement.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
171.	The incarcerated individual sent the OCO a copy of an appeal addressed to DOC staff regarding reconsideration for two Behavior Observation Entries (BOEs) they received this year.	The incarcerated person has not pursued internal resolution of this concern. Per RCW 43.06C(2)(b), the OCO cannot investigate a complaint until the incarcerated person has reasonably attempted to resolve it through the DOC internal grievance process, administrative, or appellate process.	Administrative Remedies Not Pursued
172.	Incarcerated person has been in IMU for close to two years. They have completed programming and their transfer is delayed.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO contacted DOC to better understand the custody facility plan for the incarcerated individual. DOC communicated their intention to move individual. The OCO verified that the incarcerated individual has since been moved from Intensive Management Unit.	Assistance Provided
173.	Incarcerated individual has not received any response for more than six months regarding the issue he brought to the resolution department to investigate. The individual had filed a resolution request because his emergency call button was not functioning properly.	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO found that the final resolution response was past the timeframes outlined in the Resolution Program manual. After OCO outreach, DOC staff reviewed and continued to process the resolution request. The OCO monitored to verify that the final resolution request was issued despite being overdue. DOC staff informed the OCO that the broken emergency button had been fixed.	Assistance Provided
174.	The incarcerated individual was infracted and sanctioned and was transferred to a maximum security facility as a result. Their sanction is over and their points put them at minimum custody. They have been	The OCO provided assistance. The OCO contacted the DOC about this concern several times. The DOC ultimately finalized this person's transfer.	Assistance Provided

waiting since last year and would like to be transferred out of this facility and into long term minimum custody.

175.	Person is grieving the failure and refusal of multiple staff to distribute donated books by the Secretary of State to the units at the facility. Person is also having issues with the associated grievance and did not want to withdraw grievance as staff had stated.	DOC staff resolved this complaint prior to any OCO action. DOC confirmed that the books donated by the Secretary of State were distributed throughout the institution.	DOC Resolved
176.	Family of an incarcerated individual reports their loved one is currently being held in the Intensive Management Unit (IMU) pending transfer to another facility. The individual is concerned about placement at this other facility due to difficulties he experienced when he was housed there in the past. The individual does not feel comfortable transferring there.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. DOC staff decided to place the incarcerated individual in another unit that would meet his safety needs. The individual was not transferred out of WSP.	DOC Resolved
177.	Incarcerated individual is no longer active in the Security Threat Group (STG/gang) he had been affiliated with. The individual has been approved to transfer to a close custody unit at Washington State Penitentiary (WSP) and he is concerned for his safety due to the amount of active STG members in the close custody units at WSP. The individual reports that he has notified DOC staff of his safety concerns yet is still being transferred to WSP.	The OCO spoke directly with investigators at WSP and learned that prior to OCO contact the Special Investigative Services Unit (SIS) recommended transfer to a more appropriate unit.	DOC Resolved
178.	The incarcerated individual would like a different unit counselor and does not want to return to minimum custody.	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO reviewed this person's records and verified that they have been given a new counselor and are housed in medium custody.	DOC Resolved
179.	The incarcerated individual would like to participate in graduated reentry (GRE) but was told by their counselor that	DOC staff resolved this concern prior to the OCO taking action on this complaint. The OCO reviewed this person's records and determined that the DOC had fixed an error in this person's records. The	DOC Resolved

they had been denied. This person questions their counselor's intentions and reports that the counselor provided incorrect information to them in the past.

incarcerated individual has been approved for inpatient treatment and will be released on GRE from the treatment center. This office wrote this person a letter with this information.

180.	The individual is trying to contact the Department of Corrections contract attorney. They have written multiple letters with no response. The individual has also utilized the grievance process asking for assistance from the Department of Corrections and were told that the attorney is out of their (DOC) jurisdiction.	The OCO provided self-advocacy information to complainant. The OCO contacted the DOC to find the information requested by incarcerated individual, which is now also posted in all units. The OCO provided contact information for the DOC contract attorney in the closing letter.	Information Provided
181.	Incarcerated individual reports that the infraction indicator does not match up with the violation codes on the OMNI Infraction Summary. Individual states that this suggests inaccurate information about the severity of the infractions that an individual has. This can be detrimental in clemency hearings.	The OCO provided information to the individual. The OCO contacted DOC staff at headquarters to discuss the concern. DOC staff have relayed that they are aware of the concern and have made IT staff aware of the concern as well. DOC relayed to the OCO that the error would not affect clemency or other resentencing hearings. DOC staff explained that the WAC number is changed on the infraction summary page, clemency board members are aware that WAC numbers 0-300 are general infractions, and 400 and up are serious infractions. Also, all recorded prison behavior is considered during these hearings. Changing the indicator does not change what is reviewed by the clemency board or other re-sentencing panels.	Information Provided
182.	Incarcerated individual has not received resolution request responses to four requests since his move to another facility. He has asked DOC staff about accessing the resolution requests but has not been able to access them.	The OCO was unable to substantiate that this individual had not received responses from the Resolution Program. The OCO's review determined that the Resolution Program had responded to his resolution requests. The OCO provided recommendations for accessing the resolution request responses.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
183.	Incarcerated individual reports that staff is retaliating against them for the grievance they filed by issuing an infraction.	The OCO reviewed the infraction and appeal packet as well as the documentation related to the grievance. The two incidents appear to be unrelated and there is sufficient evidence to substantiate the "some evidence" standard. The OCO was unable to locate sufficient evidence that substantiates the individual's belief that the infraction was a result of retaliation.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate

184.	All Therapeutic Community (TC) programs in the state of Washington are programmed the same, except for one facility. TC at this facility should be conducted by the same handbook as the other facilities.	The OCO was unable to substantiate the concern due to insufficient evidence. The OCO made brief outreach to DOC therapeutic community staff. The OCO reviewed DOC's Treatment Group Activities Form (TGAF) used at WSP and determined that the TC program there has the same curriculum as other facilities.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
185.	Incarcerated individual requested a closed case review. The individual says that they are being retaliated against for seeking redress from the prison and court. They say that multiple officers used excessive force on them and threatened to use OC spray on them. This incident caused them to be put in the hospital. They say that these officers are doing cell searches on them but not leaving cell receipts.	The OCO reviewed this case for a second time and agreed with the original case closure. The OCO reviewed available documentation and found there was not documentation that supports the incarcerated individual's claim that the officers grabbed them for no reason, rather, the documentation that was reviewed shows the individual was combative with staff.	Insufficient Evidence to Substantiate
186.	The incarcerated individual reports a JPAY problem that has lasted over 10 months. He reports that there is an email app firmware defect resulting in his email not working. He has opened six trouble tickets with JPAY with no success.	The OCO lacks jurisdiction to investigate this complaint because the complaint relates to an action taken by an agency other than the Washington State Department of Corrections.	Lacked Jurisdiction
187.	The incarcerated person reports concerns regarding a claim that was not handled appropriately and wants to pursue legal actions.	The OCO lacks jurisdiction to investigate this complaint because the complaint relates to an action taken by an agency other than the Washington State Department of Corrections. The concerns are regarding a tort claim and the Attorney General office.	Lacked Jurisdiction
188.	Incarcerated individual reported concerns regarding his TV that was damaged during shipping to WSP. The individual reported that his past facility provided him with one serial number and WSP provided a different one, which makes him concerned that the damaged TV was not his. The individual also had concerns related to the whereabouts of his typewriter and the status of his tort claim that was filed for compensation of his damaged TV.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. The OCO reviewed both major non-consumables inspection documents and spoke at length with DOC property staff about this issue. There were two different serial numbers noted on these separate documents. This is because the other facility did not note the correct number on their document. Serial numbers are found inside the TV imprinted into the plastic of the TV; the other facility used numbers found on a bar code sticker. The OCO's review determined that the TV in question belonged to the individual. The OCO also confirmed with DOC that the tort claim is currently being processed. The OCO also confirmed that the individual's typewriter arrived at WSP and will be	No Violation of Policy

held in long term storage until he is classified into a lower custody level unit where typewriters are allowed.

189.	The patient reports working with the OCO previously to resolve an HSR issue. He says OCO communicated that DOC HQ encourages HSRs to be kept by medical when a patient transfers because the person's condition does not change, just their location. He has been told that DOC staff have no idea about that rule and wants written confirmation from the OCO that his HSRs will stay active when he transfers to another facility.	The OCO cannot provide written confirmation that DOC will not take certain actions in the future and there is no current medical concern listed. The OCO provided the incarcerated individual information regarding Resolution Program, self-advocacy steps for follow up with OCO and contacting medical after transferring if he experiences new issues.	No Violation of Policy
190.	The person reports being wrongfully transported from another facility to WSP and that they were tricked into signing a treatment plan for one year. Person says that by not returning them to their previous facility DOC is violating policy 610.110.III.A, thus negatively impacting their ability to successfully reenter society.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. Transfer to a third facility was finalized.	No Violation of Policy
191.	Individual reports DOC staff did not begin release planning therefore his release date has been impacted and he will be released past his earned release date. Staff turnover created further delays and staff did not respond to his kites or kiosk messages.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. OCO review determined that the individual has received infractions that impact his ability to access the housing voucher program per DOC 350.200. Person also has community concerns in the county to which they are releasing. The OCO verified that the counselor is looking for housing solutions.	No Violation of Policy
192.	Incarcerated individual was placed on involuntary protective custody and housed in the Intensive Management Unit (IMU) for four months pending transfer to another facility. During this placement, DOC disposed of eight boxes of commissary food items and would not allow the items to be transferred to the new facility.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. Washington State Penitentiary currently has an Operational Memorandum (OM) in place which states, "Food items will be boxed separately. The outside of the box will be marked "food items" and include the [incarcerated individual's] name and DOC number. a) If the [incarcerated individual] does not return to the unit within 30 days, perishable (i.e., consumable) items will be sent to the Property Room. b) The Property Room will send DOC 21-139 90 Day Property Disposition to the [incarcerated individual] and appropriately	No Violation of Policy

dispose of the consumable items. Consumables will not be sent to Long Term Storage." The individual was afforded the right to choose how the food items will be disposed of and DOC is following the guidelines of this OM.

193.	The incarcerated individual had 14 boxes of property taken to storage while he waited to have surgery and since his return, DOC has not returned his belongings. He has submitted an appeal and resolution request, but DOC has not responded. It has almost been 90 days and he does not want to lose the property he had stored.	The OCO was unable to identify evidence to substantiate there was a violation of policy by DOC. Washington State Penitentiary Operating Memorandum 440.00 outlines the appeal process and allows ten days for the incarcerated person to submit an appeal after receiving the 90-day disposition notice. Because the incarcerated person did not file an appeal until several weeks after the deadline had passed, their appeal was denied.	No Violation of Policy
194.	Incarcerated individual states they are in segregation and were supposed to have a hearing for an infraction, but it never happened. They also expressed concerns about the contents of the infraction and believes staff are lying and they should not be infractioned for this behavior.	The OCO reviewed the infraction packet, hearing audio, video footage, and appeal packet and found there is some evidence to substantiate the infraction. Several of the infractions were dismissed and the ones that were upheld were supported by evidence.	No Violation of Policy
195.	The incarcerated individual reports that his judgment and sentence was amended. The lawyer, prosecutor, and judge agreed to lesser sentence and the individual says that he should be out of prison but the DOC has yet to release him.	This person was released prior to the OCO taking action on the complaint.	Person Left DOC Custody Prior to OCO Action
196.	This person had a religious item rejected that was available for order through Union Supply.	The OCO was able to substantiate this concern but could not achieve a resolution. The OCO met with DOC religious staff members and coordinators to discuss this concern. DOC staff submitted this item to the Security Management Team for review because it is metal and can pose a safety and security threat. That team will make the final decision regarding if the item can be purchased from Union Supply. As of now, several items are pending review, and the resolution outcome can take a few months. The incarcerated person was instructed to follow up with the coordinator for the review outcome.	Substantiated Without Resolution

Abbreviations & Glossary

ADA: Americans with Disabilities Act

AHCC: Airway Heights Corrections Center

ASR: Accommodation Status Report

BOE: Behavioral Observation Entry

CBCC: Clallam Bay Corrections Center

CCCC: Cedar Creek Corrections Center

CI: Correctional Industries

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

CO: Correctional Officer

CRC: Care Review Committee

CRCC: Coyote Ridge Corrections Center

CUS: Correctional Unit Supervisor

DES: Department of Enterprise Services

DOSA: Drug Offender Sentencing Alternative

EFV: Extended Family Visit

ERD: Earned Release Date

GRE: Graduated Reentry

HCSC: Headquarters Community Screening Committee

HSR: Health Status Report

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

J&S: Judgment and Sentence

MCC: Monroe Correctional Complex

MCCCW: Mission Creek Corrections Center for Women

OCC: Olympic Corrections Center

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

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

SCCC: Stafford Creek Corrections Center

SOTAP: Sex Offender Treatment and Assessment Program

SVP: Sexually Violent Predator

TC: Therapeutic Community

WaONE: Washington ONE ("Offender Needs Evaluation")

WCC: Washington Corrections Center

WCCW: Washington Corrections Center for Women

WSP: Washington State Penitentiary