

Date/Time: October 22, 2026, 1:00 – 3:00pm

Meeting Objective: The purpose of the meeting is to gather feedback from RAC members about how to improve and update hearing procedure rules found in Divisions [50](#) (GEI), [200](#) (Civil Commitment), and [550](#) (Juvenile). RAC members will provide input about rule concepts identified by PSRB staff and propose ideas for potential rulemaking based on identified gaps and issues in existing rules.

Location: Teams Meeting

Join online

Link: <https://teams.microsoft.com/meet/263970606118057?p=RECqPxCRDck64ix5qd>

Meeting ID: 263 970 606 118 057

Passcode: eJ9nQ62w

Join by Phone

Phone #: +1 503-446-4951

Meeting ID: 234 367 403#

Facilitators: Alysson Bocciolatt, Operations & Policy Analyst, Rules Coordinator
Alison Bort, Executive Director, Rules Coordinator

Meeting Agenda

Schedule	Topic	Materials
1:00 – 1:10	Welcome & Introductions	
1:10 – 1:20	Objectives of the rulemaking actions and RAC	
1:20 – 2:10	RAC feedback on staff concepts	See addendum
2:00 – 2:55	Additional concepts from RAC: Start, Stop, Continue	See addendum
2:55 – 3:00	Next steps	

Public Record: The meetings will be video recorded, and a summary distributed to RAC members. The recording will represent the official public record of the RAC deliberations. Interested party comments received at the RAC meetings will be included in the meeting record but not considered formal public comment. Formal public comment will be accepted during the public comment period.

Addendum

I. Concepts from Staff

Below are ideas that PSRB staff have raised to be considered for rulemaking. Please review the following and be prepared to provide feedback about whether these topics could be appropriately addressed through administrative rule rather than another mechanism, such as policy or procedure. You may also want to consider what the rule language should include in order to address the identified issue. For example: What should be the scope of the rule? When would it apply or not apply?

1. Document Requests for Upcoming Hearings

- a. What documents attorneys and parties must submit (e.g., exhibits, witness lists).
- b. The deadline for submitting materials before a hearing.
- c. Procedures for attorneys to submit to PSRB.

2. Clarifying “Goes to Attorney”

- a. What types of materials are automatically routed to attorneys (e.g., Board notices, written reports, treatment updates).
- b. The Board’s responsibility to provide timely disclosure that allows for meaningful case preparation.

3. Remote Hearing Procedures

- a. Update rules to reflect that all hearings are conducted remotely or leave in-person as an option?

4. Hearings Longer Than Two Hours

- a. A requirement that parties file a motion when requesting a hearing expected to exceed two hours.
- b. What must be included in that motion (estimated time, reason for extended length, witness list) and deadline for filing the motion.

5. Timelines for Submitting Exhibits

- a. For parties: witnesses, time allotment required for hearing, preparation for hearing.

6. Processes for Conditional Release to DOC

- a. Expectations about information-sharing so attorneys can meaningfully review an individual’s status and progress.

7. Community Evaluations: Requirements and Standards

- a. More prescriptive rules regarding community evaluations and the process (What does the Board need to order an evaluation? Should requests for evaluations be limited to the context of a hearing?)
- b. Define “risk review” and whether Board can deem risk review as necessary.

8. Scope of Hearings

- a. Define issues to be considered at hearings and when the Board can limit scope.
- b. Handling jurisdiction at revocation hearings (state burden, no request for discharge)
- c. No rule related to inpatient status hearings, such as when it is reviewed at end of jurisdiction and scope of the hearing.

9. Clarify When the Burden of Proof Shifts to the State

II. Concepts from RAC: Start, Stop, Continue

Below are questions to help you reflect in preparation for the meeting. Please bring your ideas about how rulemaking can help improve hearing processes. You may consider all aspects of hearings, such as preparation, file sharing, scheduling, witnesses, issues and scope, and procedures during the course of the hearing itself.

1. Start (Adopt): Identifying gaps in rules

- a. What is missing from OARs that could make hearings processes more clear, effective, and efficient?
- b. What could be added based on changes in practice and/or legislation (such as consolidation of the Board from two panels into one)?

2. Stop (Repeal): Identifying rules that should be repealed

- a. Are there rules that unnecessarily cause inefficiencies in hearings or impede due process?
- b. Are there rules that are outdated or no longer consistent with statute or current practice that should be repealed?

3. Continue (Amend): Opportunities to address pain points in existing rules

- a. What issues come up while preparing for or participating in hearings that could be addressed through a rule amendment?
- b. Are there existing rules that could be improved for greater clarity?
- c. What rules need to be updated to reflect changes in statute or practice?