

**APPROVED MINUTES
POLICE CITIZEN REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE**

**May 11, 2022
Meeting Held Remotely Via Zoom**

Members present: Emily West, Chair; Reggie Parson, Vice Chair; Rev. Lewis; Anne Hardcastle; Tim Smith; Jean-Raymond Desruisseaux (Gino), Kaylin Kerina

Members absent: none

Staff present: Jen Thompson, Tracy Boyd, Major Martin, Lieutenant Titcomb

6:02 Call to order.

Motion to adopt minutes of April 13, 2022. Second. Roll call votes 7-0.

Executive Session pursuant to 1 M.R.S. 405(6)(E) to consult with its attorney regarding its legal rights and duties under the City's Police Citizen Review Subcommittee Ordinance, including its review of policy as outlined in Section 2-76(a)(1).

6:07 Motion to enter into Executive Session; Second; Roll Call Vote: 7-0.

There was no public comment.

6:26 Out of Executive Session.

Vice Chair Parson opened the discussion of the new category policy. Chair West received more clarification on Category 1 and U from Major Martin. Traditionally, the group has reviewed Category 2 cases. Both Cat. 1 and Cat. U have been created because of the introduction of body worn cameras. The footage allows review of the interaction. Category U is a truncated review because the allegation clearly did not occur. Cat. 1 is also a truncated review, it usually a minor SOP violation which can be quickly corrected and easily determined through video footage. Because the review documentation is lighter, Attorney Thompson drafted guidelines to review those categories as well as standards to check that the complaints were categorized correctly. Ms. Hardcastle likes the format of the document. Ms. Hardcastle thought a review time element (72 hours) should be added to the first bullet point. Chair West requested a checklist from Major Martin of what documents to expect in each category. Rev. Lewis asked if the police department has standards to mirror the policy. Ms. Kerina would also like to see a checklist of what to include and what is not in the documentation. Rev. Lewis asked if there would be a disposition sheet. Chair West replied that there would not be a disposition sheet, but rather a letter closing the investigation. Attorney Thompson intentionally included language about clearly written statement, it seemed a like a reasonable expectation and she asked Major Martin his thoughts on the matter. Rev. Lewis would like a statement of IA's rationale in regards to why IA categorized the complaint as a Cat. U or 1. Ms. Hardcastle would like to have input regarding the policy from IA regarding

whether the policy matches IA's review process. Major Martin commented that the ordinance spells out the manner in which the subcommittee reviews cases. Major Martin questioned the language, specifically "non-judgmental" in the first bullet point. Attorney Thompson offered to check the language. Rev. Lewis was not concerned with the first bullet point, but rather the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th bullet points and whether they align with the group's current practice and process. Major Martin explained that each complaint is different and that the proposed policy should be reviewed up the chain of command. Rev. Lewis questioned reviewing cases that don't fit into the language of the ordinance and felt that the subcommittee should not review the new category until the group has a clear approach. Attorney Thompson checked the language and under fair, the word non-judgmental is used. She then clarified that the spirit of what the group is hoping to accomplish is a cooperative approach between the PCRS and IA. The group agreed to transmit the policy to the police department for its input and approval.

Motion to transmit the policy to the police department for input; Second; Roll Call Vote: 7-0.

Executive session pursuant to 1 M.R.S. Sec. 405(6)(F) to discuss IA2022-002.

7:00 Motion to enter into Executive Session; Second; Roll Call Vote: 7-0.

There was no public comment.

7:20 Out of Executive Session.

Motion to find that IA 2022-002 was fair; second; roll call vote 7-0.

Motion to find that IA2022-002 was thorough; second; roll call vote 7-0.

Motion to find that IA 2022-002 was timely; second; roll call vote 7-0.

Motion to find that IA 2022-002 was objective; second; roll call vote 7-0.

There was no public comment.

A discussion ensued about pushing the outstanding cases for review to July after the policy is approved at the next meeting in June. Major Martin believes there are 2 or 3 cases, but is not concerned about the group waiting to review them. Rev. Lewis asked if the group is going to abbreviate their summer schedule. The group will meet in June and July and possibly take off August. Ms. Kerina expressed concern about case review timeliness, the group should create a time standard and avoid pushing cases for review out often, thus insuring the public's trust in the group. Chair West articulated that because of the new categories, a policy needs to be in place before review of Cat. 1 and Us.

Mr. Smith offered to circulate a draft of the annual report for review by the group. Next meeting's agenda will contain approving the review policy and prioritizing goals for the remainder of the year. Mr. Smith proposes that individuals chose one goal to work on.

7:31 Motion to adjourn; Second; Roll Call Vote 7-0.