

**City of Portland
Police Citizen Review Subcommittee**

**AGENDA
September 8, 2021
6:00 PM**

1. ZOOM Information

- a. On Wednesday, September 8, 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://us06web.zoom.us/j/84423430419?pwd=YkpTNDRWZmMrMVRBOWI5UVZaWVBQdz09>

Passcode: 488944

Or One tap mobile :

US: +13017158592,,84423430419# or +13126266799,,84423430419#

Or Telephone:

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

US: +1 301 715 8592 or +1 312 626 6799 or +1 646 558 8656 or +1 253 215 8782 or +1 346 248 7799
or +1 720 707 2699

Webinar ID: 844 2343 0419

International numbers available: <https://us06web.zoom.us/j/84423430419?pwd=YkpTNDRWZmMrMVRBOWI5UVZaWVBQdz09>

2. Call to Order

3. Approval of July 14, 2021 minutes.

- a. Attachment.

4. Discussion and approval of Remote Participation Policy. Public comment will be taken.

- a. Attachment.

5. Public Comment Session

6. Final review and adoption of review criteria worksheet (Mr. Parson).

- a. Attachment.

7. Continue review of public survey
8. Executive session pursuant to 1 M.R.S. Sec. 405(6)(F) to discuss IA2021-002.
9. Adjourn

POLICE CITIZEN REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE

July 14, 2021

Meeting Held Remotely Via Zoom

Members present: Emily West, Chair; Kaylin Kerina; Rev. Lewis; Anne Hardcastle; Tim Smith; Reggie Parson, Vice Chair; Sarai Manyiel

Staff present: Anne Torregrossa

6:08 Call to order via Zoom.

Motion to accept minutes of June 9, 2021. Seconded. Roll call vote 7-0.

Rev. Lewis gave a summary of information collected in effort to better define objectives of timely, fair, thorough, and objective. Specifically with respect to timeliness, he and Mr. Parson reviewed deidentified data on IA reviews as well as updated SOP. Rev. Lewis explained that there have been some updates to the SOP and procedures recently at the PD.

The PCRS discussed and made proposed edits to the drafted review criteria form. The Subcommittee also discussed that this would be a working draft, subject to change as it gets used in evaluating cases.

Chair West stated that due to technical issues she is not able to share the additional survey summary that she had prepared but would do so at the next meeting.

Ms. Kerina stated that she had not completed the latest version of the annual report but would have that prepared for the next meeting.

The PCRS discussed the best method to provide feedback on the annual report and review criteria form. It was agreed that they might provide feedback directly to the drafter of the document or provide it at the next meeting.

The PCRS will not meet in August. The workplan is as follows:

September:

- Final review and adoption of review criteria worksheet
- Review draft Annual Report
- Executive session to review IA case

October:

- Review additional survey results summary

7:45 Motion to adjourn. Second. Roll call vote 7-0.

REMOTE PARTICIPATION POLICY OF THE
CITY OF PORTLAND POLICE CITIZEN REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE

Pursuant to 1 M.R.S. § 403-B, and after public notice and hearing, the above-named body adopts the following policy to govern the participation, via remote methods, of members of the body and the public in the public proceedings or meetings of the City of Portland Police Citizen Review Subcommittee (hereinafter, "body").

Members of the body are expected to be physically present for meetings except when not practicable, such as in the case of an emergency or urgent issue that requires the body to meet via remote methods, or an illness or temporary absence of a member that causes significant difficulty traveling to the meeting location. The chair or presiding officer of the body, in consultation with other members if appropriate and possible, will make a determination that remote methods of participation are necessary in as timely a manner as possible under the circumstances. A member who is unable to attend a meeting in person will notify the chair or presiding officer of the body as far in advance as possible.

Remote methods of participation may include telephonic or video technology allowing simultaneous reception of information and may include other means necessary to accommodate disabled persons. Remote participation will not be by text-only means such as e-mail, text messages, or chat functions.

The public, City staff, and applicants will be provided a meaningful opportunity to attend via remote methods when any member of the body participates via remote methods or when remote methods are available at a given body meeting. If public input is allowed or required at the meeting, an effective means of communication between the body and the public will also be provided. The public will also be provided an opportunity to attend the meeting in person unless there is an emergency or urgent issue that requires the entire body to meet using remote methods.

Notice of all meetings will be provided in accordance with 1 M.R.S. § 406 and any applicable charter, ordinance, policy, or bylaw. When the public may attend via remote methods, notice will include the means by which the public may access the meeting remotely and will provide a method for disabled persons to request necessary accommodation to access the meeting. Notice will also identify a location where the public may attend the meeting in person. The body will not restrict public attendance to remote methods except in the case of an emergency or urgent issue that requires the body to meet using remote methods of attendance.

The body will make all documents and materials to be considered by the body available, electronically or otherwise, to the public who attend remotely to the same extent customarily available to the public who attend in person, provided no additional costs are incurred by the body.

All votes taken during a meeting using remote methods will be by roll call vote that can be seen and heard if using video technology, or heard if using audio technology only, by other members of the body and the public. A member of the body who participates remotely will be considered present for purposes of a quorum and voting.

This policy will remain in force indefinitely unless amended or rescinded.

PCRS Criteria for Evaluating IA Investigations

-WORKING DRAFT 7/14/2021 -

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. Note: SOP 90 provides that every effort will be made to conclude review within 45 business days.				
Number of days between date of complaint to when letter was sent to complainant. Note: SOP 90 provides that investigation and command review should be completed within 60 business days of complaint.				
	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? Note: Click here to review policy issued by PPD on IA standards and policies: SOP 90				
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:

