Rhode Island Department of Corrections

Cost Benefit Analysis for New Rules and Regulations for

240-RICR-00-00-3 Conduct of Public Hearings

12/10/2025

Regulatory Analysis: Conduct of Public Hearings

Overview of Proposed Rule

The establishment of this rule provides the Rhode Island Department of Corrections (RIDOC) with a standardized, transparent, and legally compliant process for conducting public hearings related to proposed rulemaking. This regulation aligns with the Rhode Island Administrative Procedures Act (R.I. Gen. Laws § 42-35-2(a)(4)) and ensures that RIDOC's public engagement practices meet statutory requirements for notice, accessibility, and recordkeeping.

This regulation formalizes the Rhode Island Department of Corrections' (RIDOC) process for conducting public hearings related to proposed rulemakings. It includes procedures for:

- Scheduling and noticing public hearings,
- Accepting oral and written testimony,
- Recording and transcription,
- Managing disruptive conduct,
- Including all relevant materials in the rulemaking record.

Analysis of Benefits and Costs of the Proposed Rule

A. Benefits

- 1. Legal Compliance and Due Process
 - Aligns with R.I. Gen. Laws §§ 42-35-2.8 and 42-46-6, fulfilling RIDOC's obligations to facilitate public engagement and protect procedural due process in rulemaking.
- 2. Public Transparency and Civic Engagement
 - Encourages participation by clearly outlining public hearing procedures, allowing stakeholders to meaningfully contribute to policymaking.
 - Formalizes public input as a routine and valued part of administrative rule development.
- 3. Consistency Across Hearings
 - Establishes standardized procedures for:
 - Transcription or audio recording,
 - Speaker list protocols,

- Testimony order,
- Written submission process.
- Ensures each public hearing is run professionally and predictably, regardless of the topic or staff involved.

4. Maintains Order and Safety

 Provides authority to the Presiding Department Official to address disruptions, ensuring hearings can be conducted efficiently and safely.

5. Notice and Scheduling Procedures

 Align with state public access laws and ensure equitable opportunity for participation.

6. Oral and Written Testimony Processes

- Speaker lists and written testimony channels balance public engagement with orderly conduct.
- o Allows broad access, including participation by those unable to attend in person.

7. Recording and Inclusion in Rulemaking Record

 Guarantees all testimony is preserved, increasing accountability and supporting future evaluations of regulatory decisions.

8. Authority to Address Disruptions

o Protects the integrity of the hearing and the safety of participants and staff.

B. Costs

Pre-Hearing											
Responsible Party		Staff Cost	C	ost Per Hour	Task	Time		Cost			
Interdepartmental Project	\$	170,033	\$	93.42	Finding/Renting	10 min	\$	15.60			
Manager					Space						
Interdepartmental Project	\$	170,033	\$	93.42	Drafting Notice	20 min	\$	30.83			
Manager											
Principal Management and	\$	134,260	\$	73.77	Printing Copies	20 min	\$	24.34			
Methods Analyst											
Interdepartmental Project	\$	170,033	\$	93.42	Mailing Notice	20 min	\$	30.83			
Manager											
Interdepartmental Project	\$	170,033	\$	93.42	Posting to Website	10 min	\$	15.60			
Manager											
Interdepartmental Project	\$	170,033	\$	93.42	Misc. Doc Creation	30 min	\$	46.71			
Manager											
Total						80 min	\$	163.92			
Hearing											

Responsible Party	Staff Cost	Cost Per Hour	Task	Time	Cost				
Interdepartmental Project	\$ 170,033	\$ 93.42	Attending hearing	120 min	\$ 186.85				
Manager									
Principal Management and	\$ 134,260	\$ 73.77	Attending hearing	120 min	\$ 147.54				
Methods Analyst									
Administrative & Legal	\$ 220,576	\$ 121.20	Attending hearing	120 min	\$ 242.39				
Support Services									
Administrator									
Chief of Staff	\$ 215,141	\$ 118.21	Attending hearing	120 min	\$ 236.42				
Total				480 min	\$ 813.20				
Post - Hearing									
Responsible Party	Staff Cost	Cost Per Hour	Task	Time	Cost				
Interdepartmental Project	\$ 170,033	\$ 93.42	Summary for	30 min	\$ 46.71				
Manager			Director						
Total				30 min	\$ 46.71				
Non-State Personnel Costs									
Task	Cost	# of Goods	Projected Cost						
Copies	\$0.10 per copy	100	\$						
			10.00						
Translator	\$87 per hearing	1	\$						
			87.00						
Equipment	-	-	\$						
			-						
Stenographer	\$150 per hearing	1	\$						
			150						
Total			\$						
			247.00						

Alternative(s) Considered

The Department considered requiring that all written testimony for public hearings only be submitted by mail or in-person delivery. While this option would have maintained a traditional submission method consistent with past practices, it was ultimately rejected. Relying solely on physical mail introduces a risk that submissions could be delayed, misplaced, or lost in transit, particularly when hearings are subject to statutory timelines. By contrast, requiring that a copy also be sent electronically to the Department's designated email address ensures redundancy, timeliness, and receipt verification. Providing multiple submission avenues—mail, hand delivery, or email—reduces barriers to participation and enhances the integrity and completeness of the public record while imposing minimal additional administrative cost.

Summary and Determination

- Provides a clear, lawful, and consistent public hearing process that improves trust, record integrity, and decision-making while incurring only modest administrative costs.
- Offers the clearest procedural roadmap for both staff and the public, reducing confusion and legal exposure.
- Satisfies APA and open meeting law mandates, supports transparency, and safeguards the legitimacy of rulemaking outcomes.
- The submission requirements in 1.4.3(B) (mailing address, delivery options, and email copy) were established to provide multiple secure and verifiable channels for submission. This supports record integrity, ensures date-stamping consistency, and accommodates both traditional and electronic communication preferences while maintaining the confidentiality and traceability required for official requests. Collectively, these provisions enhance administrative efficiency.