

**CIVILIAN POLICE REVIEW
BOARD**

Wednesday, August 12, 2026 at 5:00 PM
City Hall, Room 209

MEMBERS

Ryan Schmitz, TJ Boisclair, Cody Austin Sims,
Chiara Liberatore, Emily Finley, Walter Biha,
Diane Herrmann, Rachel Schlein (Vice Chair, Non-Voting),
Joey Brunelle (Chair, Non-Voting)

REMOTE ACCESS INFORMATION:

meet.google.com/sgo-eits-dzk

Or dial: (US) +1 516-399-4842

PIN: 474 536 834#

PUBLIC COMMENT INFORMATION:

To submit written public comment on an agenda item, email cprb@portlandmaine.gov.
Submissions must be received by 12:00 pm the day before the meeting to guarantee their inclusion in the agenda packet. All submissions must include the commenter's name and neighborhood or legal address. To help ensure your comment is submitted for the correct item, please include the name of the agenda item (see below).

Upcoming Meetings:

September Meeting: September 9, 2026, 5:00 - 7:30 PM, City Hall, Room 24)

October Meeting: October 14, 2026, 5:00 - 7:30 PM, City Hall, Room 209)

AGENDA:

1. Introductions

2. Approval of Meeting Minutes

- i. 6-12-2026 CPRB Meeting
- ii. 7-15-2026 CPRB Meeting

3. Public Comment re: Agenda Items

4. Case Presentation & Review Standards & Process

- Review of Case Presentation & Review Standards SOP from PCRS

5. Prioritization of CPRB Tasks and Goals

Items for consideration include:

- Notification and receipt of complaints from Police Department

- Review of Meeting Procedures SOP from PCRS
- Review of Training SOP from PCRS
- Timeline re: Preparation of the Annual Report
- Funding Requests
- Data Sharing, Retention, and Preservation
- Public Education/Engagement

6. Scheduling of Meetings (September through December 2026)

7. Public Comment

8. Executive Session and Discussion of Case for Review

9. Adjourn

Minutes of the June 11, 2026 CPRB Meeting

The Civilian Police Review Board Meeting was held in Room 209 (Anita LaChance Conference Room) of City Hall, 389 Congress St., Portland, ME 04101

The Meeting was called to order at approximately 6 PM.

Present were:

Walter Biha, CPRB Member

TJ Boisclair, CPRB Member

Joey Brunelle, CPRB (non-voting) Member

Diane Herrmann, CPRB Member

Rachel Schlein, CPRB (non-voting) Member

Ryan Schmitz, CPRB Member

Cody Austin Sims, CPRB Member

Rachel Millett, Associate Corporation Counsel, City of Portland

Chief Mark Dubois, Portland Police Department

Major Dan Hondo, Portland Police Department

Lt. Jacob Titcomb, Portland Police Department

Richard Bianculli, Neighborhood Prosecutor, Portland Police Department

CPRB Members Chiara Liberatore and Emily Finley were absent.

Ms. Herrmann made a motion to appoint Ms. Schlein as chair.

Mr. Sims seconded the motion.

Motion was withdrawn.

Mr. Sims made a motion to appoint Mr. Brunelle as chair.

Ms. Herrmann seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Schmitz made a motion to appoint Ms. Schlein as vice chair.

Mr. Sims seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

The "Remote Participation Policy" was identified for discussion and review.

Mr. Sims made a motion to accept the Remote Participation Policy.

Mr. Schmitz seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Attorney Millett commenced a presentation regarding Maine's Right to Know Act (Freedom of Access Act "FOAA")

Lt. Titcomb commenced a presentation regarding the Internal Affairs (“IA”) process at the Portland Police Department.

Following a brief discussion, members agreed to schedule the next CPRB meeting for July 15, 2026 at 5 - 7 PM with an alternate date of July 22, 2026. Meetings held on following months would be tentatively scheduled for the second Wednesday of the month.

Mr. Sims made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:15 PM.

Ms. Schlein seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Minutes of the 7-15-2026 CPRB Meeting

The Civilian Police Review Board Meeting was held in Room 209 (Anita LaChance Conference Room) of City Hall, 389 Congress St., Portland, ME 04101

The meeting commenced at 5:06 PM.

Attendees: Joey Brunelle (Chair, non-voting CPRB member), Rachel Schein (Vice Chair, non-voting CPRB member), Cody Austin Sims (CPRB member, via Google Meet), Richard Bianculli (CPRB community liaison), Nicole Albert (Portland Corporation Counsel), Rachel Millette (CPRB legal advisor), Emily Finley (CPRB member), Diane Herrmann (CPRB member), Chiara Liberatore (CPRB member), TJ Boisclair (CPRB member, arrived at 5:15 PM), Ryan Schmitz (CPRB member, arrived at 5:23 PM), and Lt. Jacob Titcomb (CPRB police liaison, arrived at 5:56 PM).

Chair Brunelle commenced the meeting at 5:06 PM (0:00 mark on video recording) and began by asking for introductions from all attending. Following introductions, the Chair explained that the Board would be receiving training presentations from Attorney Nicole Albert regarding Portland Police Standard Operating Procedures and related legal concepts and Attorney Rachel Millette regarding the duties and responsibilities of the CPRB. A review of the Agenda for the August 12, 2026 CPRB meeting will follow the presentations.

Attorney Nicole Albert commenced her presentation at 5:10 PM (3:50 mark on video recording) with an overview of criminal law enforcement including probable cause standards, the summons and arrest process, detention, and confidentiality and limitations regarding the release of protected information. Her presentation followed with a review of the Portland Police SOPs that would most commonly be referred to by the CPRB.

Chair Brunelle explained to the board that every complaint that the board receives will allege a specific violation of at least one Portland Police Department SOP. Board members will be provided with that information as well as a copy of the actual SOPs that are alleged to have been violated (5:35 PM, 29:15 mark on video recording)

Attorney Albert's SOP review included an overview of (5:29 PM, 23:30 mark on video recording):

- SOP 1A (Response to Resistance/Use of Force)
- SOP 2 (Bias-Based Policing)
- SOP 10 (Professional Conduct)
- SOP 71A (Use of Restraining Devices)
- SOP 86A (Body-Worn and Vehicle Cameras)

Attorney Albert stressed the notion that most (if not, all) complaints don't include any allegations that a specific SOP was violated. The IA investigator will make an initial determination as to which (if any) SOPs may have been violated. The Board will review those determinations during their own review of the IA process.

Attorney Albert discussed the general operating procedures of body-worn cameras. The camera must remain recording once the interaction begins and the officer has pressed the record button with a few limited exceptions (privacy requested inside the home, audio muted during an investigation for investigatory purposes, etc).

CPRB member Schmitz inquired as to whether the Criminal Justice Academy requires certain SOPs and where the Portland Police Department SOPs may have originated from. Attorney Albert indicated that she would look into that question. (5:56 PM, 50:00 mark on video recording)

Attorney Millette noted the ability to recall video footage that is being recorded before the officer presses the camera's record button. (5:57 PM, 51:40 mark on video recording)

Lt. Titcomb discussed how the Portland PD SOPs were drafted to include privacy concerns from healthcare advocates as well as constitutional protections that were reviewed by community organizations such as the ACLU. (5:58 PM, 52:20 mark on video recording)

CPRB member Boisclair inquired as to whether the bodycam footage was audited from time to time to determine whether the officers were using the properly. Lt. Titcomb clarified that bodycam footage is being reviewed constantly by supervisors and staff. If any issues presented themselves, they would be directly addressed by the supervisor or the Chief. Attorney Bianculi explained that constantly reviewing bodycam would not be a prudent use of resources as there are many individuals, including the DA's office, reviewing bodycam footage during the normal course of business. (5:59 PM, 53:30 mark on video recording)

Following discussion of improved camera capabilities, Chair Brunelle raised concerns as to whether the audio transcripts provided by the new bodycam systems conflict with the recent AI ordinance. Attorney Albert, Attorney Bianculi, and Lt. Titcomb explained that the automatic transcripts cannot be used to prove what was said but can act as a good starting point for creating an accurate transcript for bodycam or vehicle camera footage (6:03 PM, 57:30 mark on video recording).

Chair Brunelle discussed the notion that some of the most complex cases allege a complaint but cannot find a specific SOP that may be alleged to have been violated. Board member Herrmann inquired as to how and how often SOPs are reviewed and updated. Attorney Albert explained that the Police Department's SOPs are constantly being reviewed and updated in conformance to recent Court decisions, statutory changes, best standards of practice, etc. (6:07 PM, 1:01:10 mark on video recording)

Attorney Millete commenced her presentation regarding the Duties and Responsibilities of the CRPB. Her presentation included an overview of the CPRB structure, roles and terms (3 years) members appointed to the CPRB, roles of support staff (including the technical advisor, community liaison, and police liaison). Chair Brunelle noted that the CPRB could request a technical advisor on an as-needed basis. Attorney Millette also reviewed the general meeting requirements and procedures including quorum requirements and meeting minutes. Board member Herrman inquired as to whether the meetings would be recorded and Attorney Bianculi confirmed that they would be recorded going forward and uploaded to the City's Agenda portal. (6:11 PM, 1:05:40 mark on video recording)

Attorney Millette reviewed the general duties of the CPRB. The Board has a duty to receive IA Complaints. The Police Department must provide IA Complaint to Community Liaison within 5 days. The board must follow Police Department SOPs when reviewing complaints and interviewing witnesses. The board will determine how complaints are to be shared with CPRB members. The board has a duty to review IA complaints to determine whether the initial IA review was thorough, timely, fair, and objective. Due process considerations may also be reviewed. (6:27 PM, 1:20:00 mark on video recording)

Chair Brunelle inquired as to whether the Board must consider the due process concerns of the individuals involved in the police interaction or the actual complainant. Attorney Millette responded that the Board must consider everyone's due process rights. (6:39 PM, 1:33:20 mark on video recording)

Attorney Millette explained that review of the IA investigation takes place after the entire IA review has been completed (arbitration, hearing, etc) and disciplinary action (if any) has been taken. (6:47 PM, 1:41:20 mark on video recording)

Board member Schmitz asked what would prevent the board from getting pulled into a trial or hearing if someone sued the Department or the City. Attorney Millette explained that this is entirely possible, however it is very unlikely and not something that she has ever heard of in her experience. (6:49 PM, 1:43:20 mark on video recording)

Attorney Millette explained that because the Board is merely reviewing the IA investigation, the Board cannot subpoena or call witnesses, there is no access to personnel files, and has no ability to impose or modify disciplinary action or lack of action imposed by the Department. The Board also has a duty to provide an annual report to the Mayor, City Council, City Manager, and Chief of Police. Recommendations (training, equipment, etc) can be included within this annual report. The board must provide an annual public hearing which may include public comment. The board can propose rules governing the Board and request funding as part of the annual City budget process. There is no requirement for the City to approve funding. The duty to maintain and protect confidentiality is provided under City Code, Section 2-85(a). (6:51 PM, 1:45:00 mark on video recording)

Board member Sims left the meeting (remotely via Google Meet) at 7:00 PM.

Vice Chair Schlein inquired as to whether the City will provide guidelines in regard to maintaining confidentiality. Attorney Millette indicated that she would confer with the IT Department regarding the sharing of information and will have more information for the Board at the next meeting including the possibility of separate Google accounts for CPRB members. (7:00 PM, 1:54:40 mark on video recording)

Board member Schmitz inquired as to whether the due process considerations that can be reviewed by the CPRB were identified in the Charter or the Ordinance. Attorney Millette confirmed that they were set out within the ordinance. (7:03 PM, 1:57:00 mark on video recording)

Chair Brunelle indicated that the Board would begin review of cases at the next meeting. Attorney Millette asked Lt. Titcomb how many cases were available and Titcomb indicated that there were seven. Vice chair Schlein and Board member Herrmann asked if we could go over the process of the case review and whether members could review the process during the review of the first case. Attorney Millette asked the Board if they wanted a simple or complex case or prioritize the case due to age of intake. Lt. Titcomb indicated that the oldest case was fairly complex. Board member Schmitz opined that the CPRB should take the oldest case first regardless of complexity. (7:04 PM, 1:58:15 mark on video recording)

Vice Chair Schlein indicated that she would also like to add items to the next agenda including how cases will be received, prior PCRS meeting procedures, an overview of the case review process, guidelines regarding mandatory training for board members, criteria used to review cases, data retention and protection, how the annual report is prepared, and discussion of funding requests for the budget process. (7:09 PM, 2:03:55 mark on video recording)

Attorney Bianculli inquired as to when the PCRS (previous subcommittee version of this board) typically received a case prior to a regularly scheduled meeting. Lt. Titcomb indicated that the prior board typically received cases 7 days prior to a meeting. Attorney Millette indicated that this was not recently possible due to the training requirements that were satisfied at the present meeting. Vice Chair Schlein indicated that additional meetings (2 meetings in the same month) may be required due to the backlog of seven cases. (7:11 PM, 2:05:30 mark on video recording)

Board member Herrmann made a motion to adjourn at 7:37 PM, motion seconded by Board member Liberatore. All remaining voting members (Schmitz, Boisclair, Liberatore, Finley, and Herrmann) voted in favor of adjournment.

August 2026

Proposed CPRB Tasks and Timeline

PROPOSED TASKS:

- 1. Form a "Receiving Complaints" subcommittee.**
 - **TIMELINE:** Discuss at **August** meeting, form committee/schedule at **September** meeting.
- 2. Implement a system for Community Liaison to update members on PPD's current IA status.**
 - **TIMELINE:** Review and vote on process/spreadsheet at **September** meeting
- 3. Develop and vote on a "Training SOP" for orientation and ongoing training expectations for CPRB members.**
 - **TIMELINE:** Review first draft at **October** meeting; target passage at **November** meeting
- 4. Discuss whether or not members would like to institute "Meeting Procedure Guidelines," and if yes, develop and approve a document.**
 - **TIMELINE:** Start discussion in **November**.
- 5. Consider developing standardized guidelines for CPRB annual reports.**
 - **TIMELINE:** Discuss and decide/develop while completing 2026 annual report in the **January - March** timeframe.
- 6. Develop CPRB "Case Presentation Guidelines."**
 - **TIMELINE:** Review draft guidelines at **September** meeting; approve at **October** meeting.
- 7. Submit funding requests to the city, if needed.**
 - **TIMELINE:** Draft requests at **October** meeting, and finalize at **November** meeting.
- 8. Establish data and privacy practice guidelines in coordination with the city.**
 - **TIMELINE:** Request **monthly** updates from city staff at meetings until guidelines have been established.
- 9. Form a "Public Engagement and Education" subcommittee.**
 - **TIMELINE:** Discuss at **August** meeting, form committee/schedule at **September** meeting.
- 10. Develop CPRB "Case Review Criteria Guidelines."**
 - **TIMELINE:** Review draft guidelines at **September** meeting; approve at **October** meeting.

PROPOSED TIMELINE:

AUGUST

- Discuss "Community Engagement and Education" and "Receiving Complaints" subcommittees
- Check in with city staff on data and privacy updates

- Discuss scheduling additional meeting(s) in September and/or October to complete administrative tasks

SEPTEMBER

- Decide on members and initial goals of 2 above subcommittees
- Review and vote on process of Community Liaison updating board of PD IAs
- Review "Case Presentation Guidelines"
- Check in with city staff on data and privacy updates
- Review "Case Review Criteria Guidelines"

OCTOBER

- Review first draft of "Training SOP"
- Approve "Case Presentation Guidelines"
- Draft funding request
- Check in with city staff on data and privacy updates
- Approve "Case Review Guidelines"

NOVEMBER

- Approve "Training and Orientation SOP"
- Discuss "Meeting Procedures" guidelines
- Finalize funding request
- Check in with city staff on data and privacy updates

DECEMBER

- Check in with city staff on data and privacy updates

JANUARY

- Begin "Annual Report" and "Annual Report Guidelines"

FEBRUARY

- Review "Annual Report" and "Annual Report Guidelines"

MARCH

- Approve "Annual Report" and "Annual Report Guidelines"

	Standard Operating Procedure	Doc #: N/A
		Rev #: 0
		Effective Date: 15-Jan-2026
Title: PCRS Meeting Process		

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this procedure is to outline the process for holding and participating in Police Citizen Review Subcommittee (PCRS) meetings per ordinance Chapter 2 Article IV Div. 2. PCRS members are encouraged to behave in a respectful, open-minded, and thoughtful manner during the meeting. The PCRS meetings should ultimately serve to deepen public trust in the Portland Police Department (PPD) and the PCRS.

2.0 SCOPE

This document applies to all PCRS meetings both executive and public.

3.0 RESPONSIBILITIES

Role	Description of Responsibilities
Chair	- Leads meeting discussions - Assigns or delegates tasks as appropriate
Vice-Chair	- Provides gentle reminders to keep discussions on topic and/or on time - Fills in for Chair's responsibilities when Chair is absent
PCRS Members	- Attend meetings and participate in discussions - Solicit or vote on motions as applicable

4.0 DEFINITIONS AND ABBREVIATIONS

Term	Definition
Sensitive Information	As defined in state statute Title 1 MRS section 402 and Title 30A MRS section 2702 Note: there are also rules around criminal confidentiality that should be followed
Meeting Attendees	All members of the PCRS and all members of supporting city staff (including police department) who are attending the current PCRS meeting
Guest Attendees	Any attendees that are not members of PCRS, city staff, or Police Department
Public Session	Public meeting instance where Meeting Attendees and Guest Attendees both attend

	Standard Operating Procedure	Doc #: N/A
		Rev #: 0
		Effective Date: 15-Jan-2026
Title: PCRS Meeting Process		

Term	Definition
Executive Session	Private meeting instance where Guest Attendees do not attend due to discussion of private or sensitive information
PPD	Portland, ME Police Department
IA	Internal Affairs (of the Portland, ME Police Department)
PCRS	Police Citizen Review Subcommittee

5.0 PROCEDURE

5.1 General Etiquette

- 5.1.1 All Meeting Attendees and Guest Attendees will adhere to Robert's Rules of Order to the best of their abilities (see Section 6: Resources for link).

5.2 Follow SOP "PCRS IA Investigation Presentation and Voting" for any activities involving IA investigation review, presentation, or voting.

5.3 Meeting Preparation

- 5.3.1 City Staff should send out the meeting agenda and relevant meeting attachments approximately one week in advance of the scheduled PCRS meeting.
- 5.3.2 Meeting Attendees should review all agenda items and attachments prior to attending the PCRS meeting.

5.4 Public Meetings

- 5.4.1 If a quorum is present (4 voting members), the Chair or designee will start the meeting (ideally no later than 5 minutes past the scheduled start time of the meeting).
- 5.4.2 The Chair will confirm that the Vice Chair is present and is willing to keep the discussions on topic and/or on time.
 - 5.4.2.1 If the Chair is absent, the Vice Chair will temporarily assume responsibilities of the Chair.
 - 5.4.2.2 If the Vice Chair is absent, the Chair will delegate someone to temporarily assume their responsibilities for the meeting.

	Standard Operating Procedure	Doc #: N/A
		Rev #: 0
		Effective Date: 15-Jan-2026
Title: PCRS Meeting Process		

- 5.4.3 The Chair will read off the meeting agenda and propose an appropriate priority for each topic along with a target meeting end time.
 - 5.4.3.1 If there are major additions to or disagreements with the agenda, Meeting Attendees should discuss and reach a consensus before proceeding.
 - 5.4.3.2 Agenda topics may be moved to an ad-hoc meeting or moved to another scheduled meeting as appropriate.
- 5.4.4 The Chair will lead the meeting discussion using the agenda topics.
 - 5.4.4.1 If there are agenda topics that involve discussion of sensitive and/or private information (e.g. an IA investigation), the Chair will solicit a motion to move the Meeting Attendees to an executive session per Section 5.5.
- 5.4.5 At the start of the meeting (after announcement of the agenda) and at the end of the meeting before executive session, the Chair will give opportunity for public comment by announcing the following expectations:
 - 5.4.5.1 Speakers will be called upon or volunteer one at a time to give public comment.
 - 5.4.5.2 Speakers will be allowed 3 minutes to talk with the ability to request 3-minute extensions.
 - 5.4.5.3 If there is a need for any accessibility assistance, the speaker may have more time granted as needed.
 - 5.4.5.4 PCRS members will acknowledge the public comments, but best practice is to not engage directly in discussion.
- 5.4.6 If any topics require voting, PCRS members will vote on the motions with a simple majority winning the vote.
- 5.4.7 After all agenda topics have been discussed or the meeting end time has been reached, PCRs members will summarize the discussions, actions and next steps.
 - 5.4.7.1 If there are any tasks or actions without volunteers, the Chair may assign the tasks or actions.

	Standard Operating Procedure	Doc #: N/A
		Rev #: 0
		Effective Date: 15-Jan-2026
Title: PCRS Meeting Process		

5.4.8 Meeting Attendees will agree on agenda topics and time/location for the next PCRS meeting

5.4.8.1 In-person meetings can be scheduled on a quarterly basis as agreed to by meeting attendees.

5.4.8.2 Ad-hoc meetings can be also scheduled as warranted

5.4.9 The Chair will solicit a motion to adjourn the meeting and if approved the meeting ends

5.5 Executive Session Meetings

5.5.1 After all meeting attendees have voted to enter executive session, meeting attendees will leave the public meeting and enter the executive session.

5.5.2 The Chair will guide the discussion of all agenda topics that contain sensitive information (e.g. IA investigations).

5.5.3 The Chair may solicit a motion to move the Meeting Attendees back to the public meeting session after all sensitive and/or private topics have been discussed.

6.0 REFERENCES

Title	Link/Location
Robert's Rules of Order	https://robertsrules.org/index.html
PCRS IA Investigation Presentation and Voting	TBF

7.0 ATTACHMENTS

N/A

	Standard Operating Procedure	Doc #: N/A
		Rev #: 0
		Effective Date: 15-Jan-2026
Title: PCRS Meeting Process		

8.0 APPROVALS

Contributor (Authored/Approved by)	Signature	Date
Author [Randall Kilty]	<u>Randall Kilty</u> Randall Kilty (Jan 15, 2026 18:12:16 EST)	15/Jan/26
Reviewer [Joey Brunelle]	<u>Joey Brunelle</u> Joey Brunelle (Jan 17, 2026 11:26:42 PST)	17/Jan/26

9.0 REVISION HISTORY

Revision	Description of Change	Date
0	New Document	15Jan2026

	Standard Operating Procedure	Doc #: N/A
		Rev #: 0
		Effective Date: 15-Jan-2026
Title: PCRS IA Investigation Presentation and Voting		

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this procedure is to describe a process for reviewing, presenting, and voting on Portland, ME Police Department (PPD) Internal Affairs (IA) investigations. Police Citizen Review Subcommittee (PCRS) members are encouraged to do their best to review IA investigations impartially and to find ways the Portland, ME Police Department (PPD) can improve the investigation process to better serve the residents of Portland, ME. PCRS members should work cooperatively with PPD and city staffers to continue to build trust between the community, PCRS, and PPD.

2.0 SCOPE

This document applies to PCRS IA investigation review, presentation, and voting. PCRS members should focus their reviewing and voting on the IA investigation process (not on PPD disciplinary actions, etc.).

3.0 RESPONSIBILITIES

Role	Description of Responsibilities
Chair	- Delegates IA cases to PCRS members as appropriate - Informs PCRS members that they are assigned to present an IA case
Vice-Chair	Fills in for Chair's responsibilities when Chair is absent
PCRS Members	- Participate in discussions and vote on IA investigations - Present IA case investigations when volunteered or assigned

4.0 DEFINITIONS AND ABBREVIATIONS

Term	Definition
Sensitive Information	As defined in state statute Title 1 MRS section 402 and Title 30A MRS section 2702 Note: there are also rules around criminal confidentiality that should be followed
Meeting Attendees	All members of the PCRS and all members of supporting city staff (including PPD) who are attending the current PCRS meeting

	Standard Operating Procedure	Doc #: N/A
		Rev #: 0
		Effective Date: 15-Jan-2026
Title: PCRS IA Investigation Presentation and Voting		

Term	Definition
Guest Attendees	Any attendees that are not members of PCRS, city staff, or Police Department
Public Session	Public meeting instance where Meeting Attendees and Guest Attendees both attend
Executive Session	Private meeting instance where no Guest Attendees do not attend due to discussion of private or sensitive information
PPD	Portland, ME Police Department
IA	Internal Affairs (of the Portland, ME Police Department)
PCRS	Police Citizen Review Subcommittee

5.0 PROCEDURE

5.1 General Etiquette

- 5.1.1 All Meeting Attendees and Guest Attendees will use and adhere to Robert's Rules of Order to the best of their ability (see Section 7: Resources for link).

5.2 Assigning and Preparing for IA Investigation Presentations

- 5.2.1 If an IA investigation is sent to PCRS for review in between PCRS meetings, the Chair will assign a PCRS member to be responsible for presenting the IA investigation at the next meeting.
 - 5.2.1.1 The Chair can use a list of PCRS members to rotate through who will be assigned (e.g. the member list published online). See Section 6.0 References.
 - 5.2.1.2 The list of PCRS members should have newer members at the bottom of the list.
 - 5.2.1.3 It is recommended that new members should not present an IA investigation until they have experienced at least one IA investigation presentation from another PCRS member
 - 5.2.1.4 When possible, a PCRS member will volunteer or be assigned to act as a backup presenter for the IA investigation.

	Standard Operating Procedure	Doc #: N/A
		Rev #: 0
		Effective Date: 15-Jan-2026
Title: PCRS IA Investigation Presentation and Voting		

5.3 When a PCRS member is assigned to present an IA investigation, they will prepare a presentation with the following information before the next scheduled PCRS meeting:

- IA Investigation Summary:
 - Timeline: date of incident, date of complaint, date of categorization, date disposition was completed, date sent to command for review, and date disposition notification was sent to complainant and applicable officer/staff
 - Summary of incident (body cam footage, cruiser footage, audio recordings, etc.):
 - Summary of complaint (interview footage, body cam footage, phone recordings, etc.):
 - Summary of supporting documents (Incident reports, Intake statements, relevant PPD standard operating procedures, etc.)
 - Summary of IA disposition (from disposition sheet):
- Questions for PPD (any clarifying questions about the investigation or incident):
- PPD and/or IA Investigation Recommendations (any improvements to IA process that could be made to yield better results in the future):
- Considerations for Complainant satisfaction (any actions that PCRS or PPD can take to improve public relations):

5.4 Presenting IA investigations

- 5.4.1 While still in the Public Session, the Chair will set the agenda for which IA investigations will be presented and discussed in an Executive Session.
- 5.4.2 After Meeting Attendees have entered the Executive Session, the Chair will guide the meeting through the agenda of IA investigation presentations and resulting discussions.
- 5.4.3 PCRS members will present the IA investigation summary information that they prepared (per section 5.3) while remaining as neutral as possible, using people-first language, and avoiding trigger words where possible.
- 5.4.4 If there are questions or recommendations for the PPD that contain private or sensitive information, these should be discussed while PPD is present.

	Standard Operating Procedure	Doc #: N/A
		Rev #: 0
		Effective Date: 15-Jan-2026
Title: PCRS IA Investigation Presentation and Voting		

- 5.4.5 PCRS members should discuss their thoughts on the Timeliness, Thoroughness, Fairness, and Objectivity of the IA investigation.
- 5.4.6 The PCRS member presenting the IA investigation will take note of questions/concerns/comments or any follow-up actions discussed.
- 5.4.7 If there are follow-up actions, PCRS members may volunteer to take responsibility for them. If there are no volunteers, the IA investigation presenter will take responsibility for the actions.
- 5.4.8 If needed, PCRS members can ask for a period of 'no-staff' discussion time to better align their ideas. During the 'no-staff' discussion, PPD will be asked to leave the call.
- 5.4.9 After all IA investigations on the agenda have been presented and discussed to satisfaction, the Chair can move the meeting back to Public Session.

5.5 Voting on IA Investigations

- 5.5.1 Once Meeting Attendees are back in Public Session, the Chair will solicit voting on the Timeliness, Thoroughness, Fairness, and Objectivity of IA investigations that were presented.
 - 5.5.1.1 If there are any IA investigations that were not presented or discussed to a satisfactory state, voting on these IA investigations can be postponed as warranted.
- 5.5.2 Members of PCRS will vote on the Timeliness, Thoroughness, Fairness, and Objectivity of the IA investigation and may use Attachment 1 for additional guidance.
 - 5.5.2.1 Though there is potential overlap in the 4 voting categories, please keep voting focused on that category only. Examples below:
 - 5.5.2.2 Timely –was the investigation completed within ~45 business days or were affected parties notified of disposition within ~60 business days?
 - 5.5.2.3 Thorough – did the IA investigation follow all the normal steps according to police procedures (see attachment 1)?
 - 5.5.2.4 Fairness – are the facts fully presented in the IA investigation to support whether or not a PPD policy was violated?

	Standard Operating Procedure	Doc #: N/A
		Rev #: 0
		Effective Date: 15-Jan-2026
Title: PCRS IA Investigation Presentation and Voting		

5.5.2.5 Objectivity — do the facts presented in the IA investigation show that there was no bias in the IA investigation?

5.5.3 If there are any PCRS members that vote 'no' to the Timeliness, Thoroughness, Fairness, and Objectivity of an IA investigation, it is recommended that they give rationale for why they are voting that way.

NOTE: If the rationale(s) for voting and/or recommendation(s) to PPD include sensitive and/or private information, these should be discussed in an executive session and not in a public session

5.5.4 If there are any recommendations for the PPD that do not contain private or sensitive information, these should also be presented in the Public Session.

5.5.4.1 For any official recommendations to PPD, PCRS should draft a written recommendation that can then be voted on by the PCRS.

6.0 REFERENCES

Title	Link/Location
Robert's Rules of Order	https://robertsrules.org/index.html
List of PCRS members	https://onboard.portlandmaine.gov/board/4371

7.0 ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1: Additional guidance for voting on Timely, Thorough, Fair, and Objective

Timely (per PPPD SOP Policy # 90):

1. For in-person complaints, Supervisor must meet with complaint within 30min of arrival at department (if resources allow)
2. Shift commander shall contact complainant within 24 hours or forward to Major for follow-up
3. Investigation by lieutenant completed within 3 days or referred to IA,

	Standard Operating Procedure	Doc #: N/A
		Rev #: 0
		Effective Date: 15-Jan-2026
Title: PCRS IA Investigation Presentation and Voting		

4. Investigations completed with professional standard review within 45 days,
5. Notification to PPD employee of investigation/rights/duties within 5 business days, unless, in the opinion of the Chief of Police, the release of this information could impede the investigation.
6. Command review within 10 days (of receipt of investigation?),
7. PPD employee advised of outcome of investigation within 60 business days,
8. Professional standards lieutenant to notify PPD employee status/delay within 15 days of completion of investigation and submission to staff for review,
9. Determination whether a complaint can be mediated or if it will require an investigation is required within 7 days (cooperative resolution)

Thorough (per PPPD SOP Policy # 90):

1. Shift commander will meet and interview all complainants unless no merit, then proceed as inquiry instead of a complaint
2. Review option of formal complaint or cooperative resolution (and forwarded appropriate form)
3. Shift commander classification is utilized as follows:
 1. Category 1: conduct has negative impact on operations or image (investigated by officer lieutenant OR IA)
 2. Category 2: conduct involves serious abuse or misuse of authority, unethical behavior, or serious adverse impact on officer/public safety (investigated by IA)
 3. Category U: unfounded or within PPD policy
4. After complaint is logged, Professional standards lieutenant will:
 1. Verify the Allegation Category assigned by the receiving shift commander;
 2. Review the subject officer's IA history;
 3. Notify the chain of command, to include the Chief of Police;
 4. Notify, in writing, within five (5) business days, any employee who is the subject of an internal investigation and provide them with a copy of their rights and duties. The notice will include the name of the complainant and the nature of the allegations unless, in the opinion of the Chief of Police, the release of this information could impede the investigation.

	Standard Operating Procedure	Doc #: N/A
		Rev #: 0
		Effective Date: 15-Jan-2026
Title: PCRS IA Investigation Presentation and Voting		

5. Notify the complainant, in writing, of the receipt of any complaint filed electronically or by mail.
6. Refer the complaint to the subject officer's Lieutenant or an Internal Affairs investigator in accordance with the guidelines below.
5. Allegations deemed Category U by the receiving shift commander will be handled as follows and the Professional Standards Lieutenant will:
 - a) A) Review the complaint form and Shift Commander's intake form and concur with the classification or recommend reclassification.
 - b) Forward the complaint and intake forms up the chain of command to the Chief of Police or designee for review.
 - c) If the chief or designee concurs that the complaint meets the definition of a Category U allegation, notify the complainant and subject officer.
 - d) If the chain of command determines the complaint has merit, reclassify the allegations and process the complaint in accordance with the new category.
6. Investigations by a Lieutenant are as follows
 1. At a minimum, a Lieutenant assigned to investigate a Category 1 Allegation should interview the complainant and the subject officer and review relevant reports, documents, and video.
 2. If a Lieutenant determines the incident is of greater complexity, or the investigation cannot be completed within 3 business days, he/she can refer the investigation back to Internal Affairs with the concurrence of the Major or higher authority.
 3. Upon completion of the investigation, the Lieutenant will summarize their findings and recommendations, in writing, and forward up the chain of command for review.
7. Investigations by Internal Affairs Investigators
 1. Review the initial complaint and compile all related reports and materials in the department's custody.
 2. Ascertain the specific allegations, note the member(s) involved and the date, time, and location of the incident. Identify any other witnesses to the incident, noting their name(s), address(es) and contact information.
 3. Compile all relevant reports, statements, and transcriptions for inclusion in the case file.
 4. Forward the transcription (if any) of each interview to the Professional Standards Lieutenant for review upon its completion.
 5. Maintain and update the Internal Affairs database for each assigned case.

	Standard Operating Procedure	Doc #: N/A
		Rev #: 0
		Effective Date: 15-Jan-2026
Title: PCRS IA Investigation Presentation and Voting		

8. Command will review investigation and reach reviewer will provide written recommendation and justification for action
9. Chief of PPD will review all internal investigations and may request additional info
10. IA will maintain/index all complaints
11. IA will track and analyze complaints to identify training, improve policies, annual state audits, annual reports, notify chief of patterns

Fair:

1. Was the IA investigation process impartial and balanced?
 1. Did everyone who took part in the investigation have a proportional input?
2. Does the IA disposition match the facts of the investigation?
3. Examples of being NOT fair:
 1. Body camera footage shows PPD acting in a way that breaks PPD policy, but the IA disposition concludes that PPD did not break any PPD policy.
 2. Multiple PPD personnel performed interviews and investigations, but only the conclusions from one person are represented in the IA disposition.
 3. There is evidence of PPD acting in a way that matches the filed complaint, but the IA disposition categorizes the investigation as Cat U.

Objective:

1. Was the evidence viewed, analyzed, and balanced in an unbiased manner?
 4. Was there no evidence of bias during the IA investigation?
2. Examples of being NOT objective:
 - a. There is evidence that a complainant insulted the PPD or made their job difficult and the IA investigation reflects a bias against the credibility of the complainant.
 - b. There is evidence that a member of PPD has a personal connection with the complainant or a material witness in the IA investigation.
 - c. There is evidence that PPD profiled or discriminated against someone based on their skin color, faith, gender, sexuality, or any other personal identifier.

	Standard Operating Procedure	Doc #: N/A
		Rev #: 0
		Effective Date: 15-Jan-2026
Title: PCRS IA Investigation Presentation and Voting		

8.0 APPROVALS

Contributor (Authored/Approved by)	Signature	Date
Author [Randall Kilty]	<u>Randall Kilty</u> Randall Kilty (Jan 15, 2026 22:48:05 EST)	15/Jan/26
Reviewer [Rachel Schlein]	<u>R.S.</u> Rachel Schlein (Jan 15, 2026 22:59:07 EST)	15/Jan/26

9.0 REVISION HISTORY

Revision	Description of Change	Date
0	New Document	15Jan2025