STATE OF OREGON BOARD OF PAROLE AND POST-PRISON SUPERVISION
BOARD ACTION FORM

Mailed 11/09/2026

Name: WIELAND, WILLIAM WARREN

SID#:	10331512	**Hearing/Action DT:**	10/21/2026	**Adjust Incept DT:**	01/08/1993
Inst:	OSP	**Board Action #:**	4	**Current Adm DT:**	05/12/1995
DOB:	12/10/1951	**Registered Victim:**	Y	**Original Admit DT:**	05/12/1995
				Offender Gt DT:	Life
				Matrix Exp DT:	Life
				PPS Exp DT:	

Activity:	MR	**Month Set:**	0	**Original Length:**	
Decision:	DEF	**Cr Tm Svd:**	854	**Sanc Length:**	
Group #:	1	**Parole Rel DT:**		**Cumulative Sanc:**	
Dang Off:	N	**Next Action:**		**Days Avail:**	

A	B	C	D	E	F	H/RS	CSR	Matrix	CHS	CSS	Grid	Min Supv
							0			0		0

SPECIAL CONDITIONS

Any General Conditions and Special Conditions set forth in this order are listed for informational and tracking purposes only; the board actually imposes supervision conditions in an Order of Supervision Conditions. This order does not affect conditions imposed in any previous Order of Supervision Conditions.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11

SIGNATURE, PRESIDING MEMBER /S/ John Bailey *KC* **SIGNATURE DATE:** 11/02/2026

STATE OF OREGON BOARD OF PAROLE AND POST-PRISON SUPERVISION
BOARD ACTION FORM

ADDITIONAL FINDINGS

NAME: 10331512 WIELAND, WILLIAM WARREN Decision: 4 10/21/2026

Board members present: Bailey, Kuklenski, Rees.

The hearing was conducted by videoconference with O.S.P.

The AIC was accompanied via video by Amanda Thibeault, his attorney.

Attending the hearing at the Board office and via video pursuant to ORS 144.750(2)(b) were J[redacted] W[redacted], granddaughter of the victim, J[redacted] W[redacted], grandson of the victim, F[redacted] V[redacted], great-granddaughter of the victim, K[redacted] V[redacted], great-granddaughter of the victim, Ryan Joslin, the Benton County District Attorney and John Chilcote, a Benton County Investigator.

Pursuant to OAR 255-032-0035, the Board finds AIC has not satisfied the burden of proof under ORS 163.105 and therefore finds AIC is not likely to be rehabilitated within a reasonable period of time. The AIC can petition for a change in the terms of confinement no less than eight years from the date of this hearing (10/21/2034).

The Board incorporates into this Board Action Form the attached final order containing the findings of facts and conclusions of law.

Pursuant to ORS 144.280, you have the right to request an interim hearing not earlier than two years from today, for the purpose of demonstrating that there is reasonable cause to believe that you may be granted a change in the terms of confinement or a firm release date.

You must exhaust your administrative remedies before petitioning the court of appeals for judicial review. Your administrative remedies are exhausted when you have requested administrative review of a Board of Parole and Post-Prison Supervision order and you have received a response from the Board addressing your request. ORS 144.335; OAR 255-080-0001. Pursuant to OAR 255-080-0001 through -0015, you may request administrative review of this order by submitting an administrative review request to the Board. Your administrative review request must be submitted within 45 days after the mailing date of this order.

STATE OF OREGON BOARD OF PAROLE AND POST-PRISON SUPERVISION
BOARD ACTION FORM

NAME: 10331512 WIELAND, WILLIAM WARREN Decision: 4

CASE#	OFFENSE	OT	SENTENCE	ST	A	CSR	BASE	SENTENCED	CTS	PPSP	O	G
County	ORS	FC	Judge	CS	P	HRS	PRIN	Committed		PPS EXP DATE		
CM930029/01	MURDER AG	MX	LIFE	CC		8	120 /168	05/12/1995	854	0	1	1
BENT	163095	UF	KNIGHT	0	N	0	N 288 /999	07/15/1986		---		

BEFORE THE OREGON BOARD OF PAROLE AND POST-PRISON SUPERVISION

FOR THE STATE OF OREGON

In the Matter of WILLIAM WIELAND SID No. 10331512 Petitioner, v. OREGON BOARD OF PAROLE AND POST-PRISON SUPERVISION Respondent.	FINAL ORDER

On October 21, 2026, the Board of Parole and Post-Prison Supervision (Board) held an aggravated murder review hearing at the Oregon State Penitentiary via video under ORS 163.105 concerning William Wieland (Petitioner). Pursuant to ORS 163.105, the sole issue under consideration at the hearing was whether or not Petitioner is likely to be rehabilitated within a reasonable period of time.

The hearing was conducted before Board Chairperson John Bailey, and Board Members Don Rees and Kelly Kuklenski, with Mr. Bailey presiding. Petitioner appeared via video conferencing and was represented by attorney Amanda Thibeault who appeared via video. Benton County District Attorney Ryan Joslin appeared via video and offered a statement on behalf of the prosecuting jurisdiction. Investigator John Chilcote attended the hearing with District Attorney Ryan Joslin and also provided a statement to the Board. Also attending via video were J[redacted] W[redacted] (granddaughter of the victim), J[redacted] W[redacted] (grandson of the victim), F[redacted] V[redacted] (great-granddaughter of the victim) and K[redacted] V[redacted] (great-

granddaughter of the victim). J[redacted] W[redacted] and J[redacted] W[redacted] provided statements to the Board.

The hearing was conducted under the rules for aggravated murder review hearings set out in OAR Division 255 chapter 032. Petitioner submitted a 10-page memorandum with exhibits authored by his attorney. All of the submitted materials were accepted into the record. The Board did not accept any confidential documents.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Petitioner was convicted of Aggravated Murder arising out of the killing of K[redacted] K[redacted] in Benton County Circuit Court Case #CM93-0029. The Court sentenced Petitioner to life in prison without the possibility of parole for thirty years.

2. Petitioner's memorandum and testimony at the hearing, as well as the information provided in the Postsentence Investigation Report (PSR) reflect that he was born in Monroe, Washington on December 10, 1951. Petitioner was removed from his parent's home as a child and spent the majority of his childhood in the foster care system. Petitioner graduated from high school and earned a diploma. When Petitioner was twenty years old, he married C[redacted] K[redacted] He worked as an electrician and resided with his wife in Shelton, Washington. In 1974, Petitioner and C[redacted] had their first child J[redacted] In 1977, Petitioner and his family moved to Anacortes, Washington, and the couple had their second child J[redacted] In 1983, the family purchased a 16-acre farm in Benton County, and the family moved there in 1984 where Petitioner owned and managed a dairy farm.

3. Petitioner was convicted of Burglary II in Washington State in 1970. He was sentenced to 15 years in prison but was paroled on May 29, 1972. His parole was discharged on

December 6, 1974. At the hearing, Petitioner testified he broke into a hardware store and took a safe. He testified he did it for financial reasons.

4. The Board adopts the facts of the instant offense as articulated in the Scope of Crime section of the PSR dated July 18, 1995, included in the Board's hearings packet. The Board will highlight in this order some of the facts of the instant offense that are particularly pertinent to the Board's findings. On June 21, 1984, a fire broke out in a barn on the W[redacted] property. According to an Affidavit of Counsel included in the Board's packet, Petitioner told an individual named Howard Nash that he "would find $600 lying around if Nash were to burn down the barn." Affidavit of Counsel, pg. 2. The barn burned down and Petitioner received $25,000 in insurance money which he used to build a milking parlor and new dairy barn. In late March of 1985, the victim K[redacted] K[redacted] who was the mother of C[redacted] K[redacted], moved into another home built for her on Petitioner's property. On June 9 and June 16, 1986, fires broke out in Petitioner's family's residence. It was determined that the fire on June 16 was intentionally set. Then on Sunday, June 22, 1986, another fire was intentionally set in the family home. At the time of the fire, Petitioner was in the milking parlor while the rest of the family was asleep. C[redacted] woke to the sound of the smoke alarm and called to the children to come downstairs. The dining room was engulfed in flames and C[redacted] and the kids were trapped. C[redacted] reported beating on a window to try and break the glass. A passing motorist saw the fire and rescued C[redacted] and the children by breaking the master bedroom window to create an exit.

Petitioner reported to the State Fire Marshall staff that he believed the fire was started by his daughter J[redacted]. The fire destroyed the family home and the W[redacted] family received $80,000 from the insurance company. Petitioner and the family moved into the victim's residence while plans were made to build a new family home. On June 22, 1986, the victim spoke with a friend,

Julie Raney. Ms. Raney asked the victim if someone was trying to kill C[redacted] and the children. The victim replied yes. The victim had also previously told a pastor someone was trying to hurt the family and she was "scared to death."

On July 15, 1986, Petitioner got up at 6:00am. Petitioner later had breakfast with the victim and his son J[redacted] before going back to work. At about 10:20am, Petitioner returned to the residence to change his clothes before attending a hearing at the Benton County Courthouse at 11:30am. Petitioner returned to the property about 12:30pm. C[redacted] reported she had not seen her mother, the victim, and Petitioner claimed he had not seen her since he passed her on his way from the barn at about 10:15am that morning. Defendant went to various places around the property looking for the victim. At C[redacted]'s request, he went into the woods to the north of the property. Petitioner then yelled for C[redacted] to call the police after finding the victim's body. An investigation and autopsy uncovered that the cause of death was one of multiple stab wounds the victim suffered. It was also determined that from her stomach contents and body temperature, that death occurred between 10:00am and 11:00am. Approximately 12 feet from the body was a camel cigarette butt, which was consistent with the type of cigarettes that Petitioner smoked. Approximately 6 feet from the victim's body was a fresh footprint which was later matched to boots Petitioner had been wearing that morning.

Petitioner was interviewed by Detective Larry McCloskey. Petitioner did not admit to the murder and suggested C[redacted]'s brother Lanny K[redacted] may have been responsible as he had mental health and addiction issues and would have had a lot to gain financially. It was determined Lanny K[redacted] was not in Oregon at the time of the murder. The knife used against the victim was not found. In September of 1986, Petitioner and the family moved back to Washington and lived in a rented home in Snohomish for several months while Petitioner

looked for a dairy farm to lease. In May of 1987, the family moved onto a dairy farm property north of the town of Duvall in King County.

On December 18, 1987, Petitioner asked his wife C[redacted] to inspect a bicycle he had purchased for one of the children. The bicycle was stored in a loft in an old shed on the property. The loft was reached by climbing an exterior stairway to a landing with no railing. C[redacted] inspected the bicycle and was standing on the landing when she was pushed suddenly from behind. She landed on a pile of metal pipes and gates, and she sustained serious injuries to her face and arms. Petitioner was the only person standing near C[redacted] when she was pushed, but Petitioner denied pushing her and claimed that it was possible her brother Lanny may have been responsible.

In December of 1988, Petitioner and the family sold the Benton County farm to Ron and Leila Spencer. The Monroe Police Chief informed the Spencers about the murder of K[redacted] K[redacted] and informed them the murder weapon had never been found. They were encouraged to contact the sheriff if they ever discovered a suspicious knife. On July 20, 1989, Mr. Spencer was using a torch to cut vertical pipes that Petitioner had previously installed in concrete. After cutting one of the pipes, a rusty wooden handled knife fell out. The knife was provided to law enforcement and it was determined to have been consistent with the size, shape, and wounds inflicted on the victim.

In August of 1989, Petitioner purchased the farm in Duvall in King County. In November of 1990, a flood caused damage to the dairy farm property. In August of 1991, Petitioner sold the cows on the farm. Then on September 16, 1991, four fires were set on the property which were determined to have been intentionally set. Three of the four buildings on the property were

destroyed. Petitioner filed an insurance claim and received $98,059.72 for the destroyed buildings.

In July 1992, C[redacted] decided to stop living with Petitioner. In December of 1992, Petitioner admitted to C[redacted] that he had pushed her from the second-floor landing five years previously. He stated he did not know why he had done it. On January 8, 1993, Petitioner was arrested for the murder of the victim.

At Petitioner's murder review hearing in 2019, Petitioner denied committing the murder. At Petitioner's murder review hearing on January 19, 2022, Petitioner changed his story and admitted to committing the murder. Petitioner reported prior to the murder he was angry at the victim for telling other people that J[redacted] was responsible for the fires being set in the family home. Petitioner was also angry that the victim's son Lanny K[redacted] was going to be allowed to live on the family property. As reflected in the 2022 Final Order, Petitioner told the then Board that because Lanny had mental health and addiction issues, he felt like he needed to prevent him from living there to protect his family. Petitioner also reported he had been in a sexual relationship with the victim prior to the murder. He reported he had decided to stop the sexual relationship and he had learned the victim had been having an affair with another individual. He also told the Board he had agreed to meet the victim in the woods where the body was recovered, and that on the way to meet her he grabbed the murder weapon from a butcher block. When he met the victim in the woods he began stabbing her. He told the Board in 2022 his intention had been just to talk to the victim, but he then got angry and started stabbing her. He reported not remembering swinging the knife at her.

At Petitioner's 2026 murder review hearing, Petitioner changed his story again. He told the Board he murdered the victim after she admitted to setting the June 22, 1986 fire. After she

admitted to setting the fire and closing C[redacted]'s bedroom door, he testified he stabbed her. When asked by the Board why he grabbed the knife out of the butcher block when he went to meet the victim, he stated he was planning on using it on her if she admitted to setting the fires. This is in contrast to his statements at the 2022 hearing wherein he stated he did not know why he grabbed the knife. Petitioner gave conflicting accounts of what he did with the knife after the murder. In Petitioner's Memorandum, he reported he "hid the knife after the murder, hoping that investigators would not locate it" and that "the knife was located long after Mr. Wieland sold the farm, by its next owner." Petitioner's Memorandum pg. 3, (2026). However, Petitioner told the Board at this hearing the knife located in the pipe by the next owner was not the murder weapon, and that he had cleaned the knife used in the murder and placed it back in the butcher block.

As to the incident where Petitioner pushed his wife C[redacted] off a landing in December 1987, at the 2022 hearing, Petitioner denied pushing her. He told the then Board he accidentally bumped her which resulted in her falling. He told the Board this in spite of evidence he had previously admitted to pushing her. Petitioner did admit to previous domestic violence against C[redacted] in that he had previously slapped her. At the 2026 murder review hearing, Petitioner returned to admitting to intentionally pushing her off the landing. He stated he did so because he blamed her for having to leave Oregon, as he stated he would not have stayed in Oregon without her and the children. He also suggested he was angry at her and she had an "attitude" and was not excited about seeing the bike he bought for one of the children.

5. After Petitioner's murder review hearing in 2019, he began participating in Non-violent Communication. However, Petitioner stopped participating when the institution stopped group programming due to the Covid-19 pandemic. The record indicates Petitioner obtained certificates of completion in 2020 for anger management programming and domestic violence

programming. Since his 2022 hearing, Petitioner has engaged in religious self-study including bible study. He has not engaged in any formal programming or reformation activities outside of religious study. He did read several chapters of the GOGI book. Petitioner has worked a number of jobs in the institution including as a medical orderly, in furniture assembly, food services, and janitorial work among others.

6. Petitioner has committed one formal disciplinary violation. In 2016, Petitioner received a disciplinary report for Contraband II stemming from him possessing 40 batteries.

FINDING OF ULTIMATE FACT

By a unanimous decision, Petitioner has not satisfied his burden of proving, by a preponderance of evidence, that he is likely to be rehabilitated within a reasonable period of time.

DISCUSSION

The Board has considered each of the ten non-exclusive factors set out in OAR 255-032-0020. While many of the factors are neutral or weigh in Petitioner favor, other factors weigh so heavily against Petitioner that the Board concludes that he has not satisfied the burden of proving that he is likely to be rehabilitated within a reasonable period of time.

Under OAR 255-032-0020, the board considers ten criteria when making a decision to determine whether or not a petitioner is likely to be rehabilitated within a reasonable period of time. The criteria include:

(1) The inmate's involvement in correctional treatment, medical care, educational, vocational or other training in the institution which will substantially enhance his/her capacity to lead a law-abiding life when released;

(2) The inmate's institutional employment history;

(3) The inmate's institutional disciplinary conduct;

(4) The inmate's maturity, stability, demonstrated responsibility, and any apparent development in the adult's personality which may promote or hinder conformity to the law;

(5) The inmate's past use of narcotics or other dangerous drugs, or past habitual and excessive use of alcoholic liquor;

(6) The inmate's prior criminal history, including the nature and circumstances of previous offenses;

(7) The inmate's conduct during any previous period of probation or parole;

(8) The inmate does/does not have a mental or emotional disturbance, deficiency, condition or disorder predisposing them to the commission of a crime to a degree rendering them a danger to the health and safety of the community;

(9) The adequacy of the inmate's parole plan including community support from family, friends, treatment providers, and others in the community; type of residence, neighborhood or community in which the inmate plans to live;

(10) There is a reasonable probability that the inmate will remain in the community without violating the law, and there is substantial likelihood that the inmate will conform to the conditions of parole.

APPLICATION OF THE FACTORS

I. The Board finds that the following criteria weigh in favor of Petitioner:

(2) The inmate's institutional employment history;

Petitioner has worked in a variety of positions within the institution. The Board recognized Petitioner's employment history and commitment to work and found this factor weighed in his favor.

(3) The inmate's institutional disciplinary conduct;

Petitioner's last, and only, disciplinary report was for Contraband II in 2016. The Board considered Petitioner's disciplinary free conduct for approximately ten years was significant enough for the Board to weigh this factor in his favor.

(5) The inmate's past use of narcotics or other dangerous drugs, or past habitual and excessive use of alcoholic liquor;

Petitioner does not have a history of alcohol and drug addiction. Accordingly, this factor was weighed in his favor.

II. The Board finds that the following criteria do not weigh in favor of or against Petitioner:

(6) The inmate's prior criminal history, including the nature and circumstances of previous offenses;

Petitioner has one prior conviction for Burglary II out of Washington State from 1970. The Board did not find Petitioner's criminal history was so significant as to weigh it against him.

(7) The inmate's conduct during any previous period of probation or parole;

Petitioner was on parole following his release on the Burglary II conviction out of Washington State. Petitioner's parole was discharged in 1974. The Board recognized Petitioner appeared to have successfully completed parole. However, due to the significant amount of time since his parole was discharged, and considering the lack of sufficient evidence in the record as to the full extent of Petitioner's conduct on parole, the Board found this factor neither weighed for or against Petitioner.

(8) The inmate does/does not have a mental or emotional disturbance, deficiency, condition or disorder predisposing them to the commission of a crime to a degree rendering them a danger to the health and safety of the community;

There was insufficient evidence for the Board to conclude that Petitioner does or does not suffer from a mental or emotional disturbance, deficiency, condition, or disorder predisposing her to the commission of a crime rendering her a danger to the health or safety of the community.

(9) The adequacy of the inmate's parole plan including community support from family, friends, treatment providers, and others in the community; type of residence, neighborhood or community in which the inmate plans to live;

Petitioner's parole plan is to reside with his sister in Portland who has reportedly offered him a room to stay in. He identified his sister is a support for him in the community. Since his last hearing, he testified he gave his sister the approximate $9,000 in savings he had to place in outside accounts. He would also plan to receive social security benefits. Overall, the Board concluded Petitioner's parole plan was adequate, but not comprehensive or thorough enough to find this weighed in his favor.

III. The following criteria weigh against Petitioner. The Board finds that these factors together weigh so heavily against Petitioner that the Board is unable to find that he has proven that he is likely to be rehabilitated within a reasonable period of time:

(1) The inmate's involvement in correctional treatment, medical care, educational, vocational or other training in the institution which will substantially enhance his/her capacity to lead a law-abiding life when released.

Prior to Petitioner's hearing before the Board in 2019, Petitioner had not engaged in any substantial rehabilitative programming in the institution. In 2020, he obtained certificates for anger management and domestic violence programming. He participated in some non-violent communication classes, but those ended in 2020 due to the Covid-19 pandemic. Petitioner has failed to engage in any meaningful programming since his last hearing in 2022. While the Board recognizes he has engaged in some self-study of the GOGI program and engaged in bible study, it is clear to the Board Petitioner does not engage in programming because he chooses not to do so.

For instance, at his 2026 hearing, Petitioner told the Board if non-violent communication had not been stopped by Covid he would not have gone back anyway. He cited profanity being used in the group as the reason he did not attend. The Board considered that to be an absolutely ridiculous excuse. When asked by the Board what he learned from reading several chapters of the GOGI book, he said "nothing" and stated it stole from the Bible. He discussed an attempt by another AIC to get him to attend Alternatives to Violence programming. He told the Board if he had attended that class then the only thing he would have taken from it is "cuss words." When asked by the Board what he learned from non-violent communication when he participated in it, he could not provide anything he learned. Finally, in spite of previously participating in some domestic violence programming, when asked what triggers he has for engaging in domestic violence, he told the Board he had never heard "of the trigger thing before." The Board is frankly dumbfounded by both his unwillingness to participate in programming, and his seeming inability to benefit from the few programs he has engaged in. It is particularly troubling, given the Board has pointed out his lack of programming after past murder review hearings as a reason the Board has not found in his favor. The Board determined this was evidence strongly against his being

likely to be rehabilitated within a reasonable period of time, as he clearly thinks he is fine "as is" and is not willing to take professional feedback and better himself in any meaningful way.

Lastly, Petitioner's murder appeared to be motivated by an inability to manage interpersonal conflict, manage anger, and if Petitioner is to be believed, includes elements of domestic violence as the victim and Petitioner had recently had a sexual relationship. Petitioner also admitted to past domestic violence against his wife by slapping her and pushing her off a landing causing serious injury. Accordingly, Petitioner's inability to demonstrate any benefit from, and internalize what he learned, from anger management, domestic violence, and conflict resolution programming was a significant concern of the Board. The Board was simply not able to believe Petitioner has been able to identify and address how he can manage anger, interpersonal conflict with family members, and domestic violence in the community. Accordingly, the Board heavily weighed this factor against Petitioner.

(4) The inmate's maturity, stability, demonstrated responsibility, and any apparent development in the adult's personality which may promote or hinder conformity to the law;

As discussed above, the Board was unable to determine the extent to which Petitioner has addressed problems with anger management, domestic violence attitudes and beliefs, and interpersonal conflict with family members due to Petitioner's inability to internalize programming concepts. His clear lack of desire to engage in programming to address these deficits appears ingrained and unlikely to change. As discussed above, the Board considered this as evidence he lacks maturity and does not demonstrate responsibility.

The Board also maintains significant concerns about Petitioner's insight into the offense conduct, as well as his willingness to be truthful. In 2019, Petitioner denied committing the murder. In 2022, he admitted to the murder, but denied pushing his wife off the landing. He told

the Board in 2022, he was unable to say why he grabbed a knife before going to talk to the victim, and he was adamant he only wanted to talk to the victim and did not intend to hurt her. In 2022, he suggested his anger at the victim prior to the murder was based on concerns about her son Lanny K[redacted] moving to the property, statements he reported she made that J[redacted] was responsible for the fires at the home, after learning she had an affair with another individual. However, in 2026, Petitioner now states he stabbed the victim after she admitted to setting the fire in the home and that he knew he would use the knife on her if she admitted to doing so. When asked by the Board why he did not bring this up previously, that the victim had admitted to setting the fire that almost killed his wife and children, he had no significant answer. Given Petitioner's continuing story changes, the Board finds his assertions to lack any credibility.

It is especially concerning to the Board that Petitioner is now asserting the victim is responsible for at least one of the fires at the Benton County residence. The Board saw this is a blatant attempt to deflect responsibility. Multiple fires occurred both before the victim resided with Petitioner and after she was murdered. In nearly every instance, Petitioner had everything to gain from the fires, as he filed multiple insurance claims to receive financial benefit from the fires occurring. The average person goes their entire lifetime without a fire occurring on their property. His claims are frankly ridiculous. The Board was concerned about Petitioner's assertions for two primary reasons. First, without a truthful examination of his motivations for the murder and other past violence, the Board is unable to determine if Petitioner has addressed all of his relevant risk factors to such an extent to make him no longer dangerous. Second, the Board suspects Petitioner of lying to the Board and finds his statements completely lacking in credibility.

(10) There is a reasonable probability that the inmate will remain in the community without violating the law, and there is substantial likelihood that the inmate will conform to the conditions of parole.

Due to issues noted by the Board above, the Board was unable to determine there is reasonable probability that Petitioner will remain in the community without violating the law. The Board strongly encourages Petitioner to engage in any available programming and internalize what he learns, and to address the concerns listed in this final order prior to his next hearing before the Board.

IV. Extended Deferral Factors pursuant to OAR 255-062-0016

The Board also unanimously finds that it is not reasonable to expect that Petitioner would be granted a change in the terms of confinement before eight years from the murder review hearing which occurred on October 21, 2026. In determining an eight year deferral was the appropriate length, the Board strongly considered Petitioner has made little progress in the four years since his last hearing in 2022. Accordingly, the Board did not expect meaningful growth from Petitioner in a shorter period of time. The Board's decision was also based on the following factors in OAR 255-062-0016:

(4) Inmate's failure to demonstrate understanding of the factors that led to his/her criminal offense(s);

As articulated above, the Board found that Petitioner continues to struggle with insight into his prior violent behavior, including acts of domestic violence against his wife and the murder victim. Petitioner has more work to do in being accountable and honest with himself about the motivations for his prior crimes. The Board is concerned that his limited insight creates a barrier to Petitioner being able to successfully identify and address any relevant risk factors to

prevent future offending. Without significant improvement in this area, the Board is unable to identify Petitioner has made the necessary changes to ensure he is not capable of similar violent conduct in the future. Conversely, it is clear to the Board Petitioner remains dangerous to family members and any potential romantic partner.

(5) Inmate's demonstrated lack of effort to address criminal risk factors of psychological or emotional problems, and

(8) Inmate's failure to seek out and benefit from programming including but not limited to sex offender treatment, batterers intervention programs, anger management, cognitive therapy, and victim impact panels where available

As detailed above, the Board is significantly concerned with Petitioner's lack of programming and his inability to demonstrate he has internalized programming to address his prior offending behavior and risk factors. It is clear Petitioner does not engage in programming because he chooses not to do so. The Board sees little evidence this is likely to change, especially considering he has had four years to demonstrate his commitment to programming to better himself. While the Board sees little reason to expect growth in this area, the Board encourages Petitioner to engage in as much programming as possible, and to work to internalize the programming he engages in to be able to apply those lessons and concepts to his own violent history.

The Board determined that due to the significant deficits that still exists in Petitioner's insight, considering the amount of programming that is likely still necessary for Petitioner to internalize and address his relevant risk factors, and adequately address the other concerns noted by the Board in this final order, that Petitioner would need a minimum of eight additional years to cure these deficits and address the Board's concerns.

ORDER

The Board unanimously finds that Petitioner is not capable of rehabilitation within a reasonable period of time, and therefore issues BAF #4 on this date to memorialize its decision.

DATED this 2nd day of November, 2026.

NOTICE TO PETITIONER: You have the right to request administrative review of this final order. A request for administrative review must be submitted to the Board within 45 days of the mailing date of this final order. A request for administrative review must be in writing and in the manner and form required under the Board's administrative rules at OAR 255 Division 080.

You are entitled to judicial review of the Board's decision by the Oregon Court of Appeals, following administrative review. Judicial review may be obtained by filing a petition for review within 60 days from the mailing date on the Administrative Review Response provided by the Board. Judicial review is pursuant to the provisions of ORS 144.335.