

City of Portland Police Citizen Review Subcommittee

AGENDA July 14, 2021 6:00 PM

1. Zoom information

a.

On Wednesday, July 12, 2021 at 6:00 p.m., the Police Citizen Review Subcommittee will conduct a virtual meeting via Zoom, as allowed by 1 M.R.S. Sec. 403-A.

Please allow your computer to install the free Zoom app to get the best meeting experience. If you are not able to attend the meeting live, the City will be posting a recording of the meeting after it has concluded.

Please click the link below to join the webinar:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/85259527549?pwd=MG44MVJhWEIxMUNvb0ZFS3Npb1c0UT09>

Passcode: 836366

Or One tap mobile :

US: +19292056099,,85259527549#,,,,*836366# or

+13017158592,,85259527549#,,,,*836366#

Or Telephone:

Dial(for higher quality, dial a number based on your current location):

US: +1 929 205 6099 or +1 301 715 8592 or +1 312 626 6799 or +1 669 900 6833 or +1 253 215 8782 or +1 346 248 7799

Webinar ID: 852 5952 7549

Passcode: 836366

International numbers available: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/85259527549?pwd=MG44MVJhWEIxMUNvb0ZFS3Npb1c0UT09>

2. Call to Order

3. Approval of June 9, 2021 minutes

a. Attached.

4. Public Comment Session

5. Discuss defining standards of whether an investigation was thorough, fair, timely, and objective (Rev. Lewis and Mr. Parson).

a. Attachment.

6. Continue discussion of survey results.
7. Adjourn

POLICE CITIZEN REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE

June 9, 2021

Meeting Held Remotely Via Zoom

Members present: Emily West, Chair; Kaylin Kerina; Rev. Lewis; Anne Hardcastle; Tim Smith

Members absent: Reggie Parson, Vice Chair; Sarai Manyiel

Staff present: Anne Torregrossa

6:00 Call to order via Zoom.

Chair West welcomed new PCRS members Anne Hardcastle and Tim Smith. Subcommittee members introduced themselves.

Motion to accept minutes of May 12, 2021. Seconded. Roll call vote 3-0 (Hardcastle and Smith abstaining).

There was no public comment.

Chair West presented a powerpoint summarizing the findings of the community survey. For each chart, Chair West explained the question presented, the context of that question and the results of the survey.

[Rev. Lewis temporarily left meeting].

The PCRS discussed next steps in analyzing the comments provided in response to the survey and how to ultimately present results to the City Manager and to the Public. Ms. Kerina suggested that the PCRS solicit feedback from the public and social justice groups.

Ms. Kerina next summarized the goals of reviewing and editing the annual report for accessibility, etc. She will have a draft for the Subcommittee to review by next meeting.

PCRS discussed that the plan was to review criteria for defining their review standards of timely, fair, thorough, and objective. Ms. West explained that the goal of the exercise is to help standardize review of IA investigations and get clarity on the process. Rev. Lewis is spearheading editing a proposal on that and reviewing relevant SOPs.

[Rev. Lewis rejoined the meeting].

Rev. Lewis explained that he received the requested data from IA but had not yet had a chance to meet with Mr. Parson, who is collaborating on this project. Rev. Lewis had also received the relevant SOPs to review.

Ms. Hardcastly questioned how much public attendance the PCRS typically saw. Chair West explained that the PCRS received significant attention after the murder of George Floyd. Rev. Lewis explained that the Subcommittee also received attention after the PCRS submitted a memo regarding the PD's Use of Force Committee to the City Manager.

The PCRS next discussed its workplan for July:
Discuss survey results (Ms. West)
Discuss annual report (Ms. Kerina)
Discuss review standards (Rev. Lewis and Mr. Parson)

[Ms. Manyiel joined the meeting]

6:58 Motion to adjourn. Second. Roll call vote 6-0.

PCRS Criteria for Evaluating IA Investigations

Subcommittee member name: _____

Date: _____

IA Investigation Number: _____

Timeliness of investigation	# of days	-	-	Additional Comments
Number of days between date of complaint and date of IA letter transmittal to command staff.				
Number of days between date of complaint to when letter was sent to complainant.				
	Yes	No	N/A	If no, explain.
If delays occurred, did IA provide a reasonable explanation given either the level of complexity of the case or outside demands that took precedence over the timely disposition of the case in their report?				
Thoroughness of Investigation	Yes	No	N/A	If no, explain.
Was key Information evidence (including available video and audio files, telephone logs, electronic media posts, photos, written statements, etc.) pursued and analyzed by IA?				
Were all witnesses identified in the complaint interviewed?				
Was an adequate level of due diligence used to locate and contact witnesses?				
Did the investigator elicit all relevant information from the complainant, witnesses and officer(s) in their interviews?				
Did the investigator conduct follow up interviews with the complainant, witnesses or officer(s) to clarify any conflicting or new information				

discovered after the initial interviews, if applicable.				
•				
•				
•				
•				
Fairness of Investigation	Yes	No	N/A	If no, explain.
• Was the investigation process followed as defined by IA department standards and policies?				
• Did the investigator approach the investigation in an impartial, non-judgmental way?				
•				
•				
•				
Objectivity of Investigation	Yes	No	N/A	If no, explain.
• Did the investigator exhibit professionalism and neutrality with the complainant, witnesses or officer(s) in his/her interviews?				
• Did the investigator evaluate all facts and evidence in a dispassionate, objective manner in the IA report				
• Was open-ended questioning used by the investigator with the complainant, witnesses or officer(s)?				
• Did the investigator explain his or her role and the IA process, including the role of the PCRS?				

Comments from reviewer: