



City of Eugene CIVILIAN REVIEW BOARD

It is the mission of the Civilian Review Board to provide fair and impartial oversight and review of internal investigations conducted by the City of Eugene Police Department involving allegations of police misconduct, use of force and other matters. The Board will strive to build trust and confidence within the community and to ensure that complaints are handled fairly, thoroughly and adjudicated reasonably. The Board will encourage community involvement and transparency in order to promote the principles of community policing in the City of Eugene.

Civilian Review Board Meeting Agenda

Tuesday, June 8, 2021 – 5:30pm

Via Webinar: <https://eugene-or-gov.zoom.us/j/88981357530>

Webinar ID: 889 8135 7530

Password: June8CRB

Or join by phone:

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

971 247 1195	669 219 2599	669 900 6833	720 928 9299
206 337 9723	213 338 8477	253 215 8782	346 248 7799
602 753 0140	312 626 6799	470 250 9358	470 381 2552
646 518 9805	651 372 8299	786 635 1003	929 205 6099
	267 831 0333	301 715 8592	

Toll Free:

833 548 0282	877 853 5257	888 475 4499	833 548 0276
--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------

International numbers available: <https://eugene-or-gov.zoom.us/j/kcDPEzMaN>

<u>Item</u>	<u>Time (Starting)</u>
1. Agenda and Materials Review	5 minutes (5:30pm)
2. Public Comment	10 minutes (5:35pm)
3. Comments from Board Members and Commission Liaisons	10 minutes (5:45pm)
4. Minutes Approval (Minutes from May meeting)	5 minutes (5:55pm)
5. Case Review: Review of Investigation into an Officer's Use of Deadly Force on November 30, 2019	60 minutes (6:00pm)
6. Auditor Report	15 minutes (7:00pm)



**City of Eugene
Civilian Review Board
Page 2 of 2**

9. Closing Comments

15 minutes (7:15pm)

10. Adjourn

(7:30pm)

Upcoming Meetings:

July 13, 2021

August – break (tentative)

September 14, 2021

MINUTES
Civilian Review Board
Zoom Webinar

May 11, 2021
5:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Carolyn Williams, chair; Lindsey Foltz, Bill Whalen, Bernadette Conover, José Cortez, Rick Roseta, Michael Hames-Garcia, Civilian Review Board members; Beatriz Otero-Hernandez, Vicki Cox, Leia Pitcher, Police Auditor’s Office; Jason Berreth, Ryan Nelson, Stacy Jepson, Eugene Police Department.

ABSENT: None.

Chair Williams convened the Civilian Review Board (CRB) at 5:31 p.m. Everyone present introduced themselves. There was a quorum present.

1. Agenda and Materials Review

There were no changes made to the agenda.

2. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

3. Comments from Board Members and Commission Liaisons

Foltz shared that the Ad-Hoc Committee wrapped up their work and the document was available for the public online.

Conover brought up that after Roseta’s comments at the last meeting about the Ad-Hoc Committee, the CRB talked about putting a response together to go to City Council. Pitcher had said they could incorporate their comments into their annual report. Pitcher stated that the 2020 annual report draft was almost ready for the CRB to look at. Roseta thought creating a small report from the CRB about the value of the CRB would be less bulky and more helpful for City Council to digest. Conover wanted to put something together describing CRB’s work over the last ten years. Pitcher said a small group from the Board could get together and draft a report to bring back to the whole CRB. The Ad-Hoc report would go to City Council on Monday May 17, 2021. Whalen liked the idea of doing a separate report and then also including it in the annual report as well. Roseta, Conover, and Hames-Garcia volunteered to draft the response. They would come back with it at their June meeting.

Hames-Garcia would give more information on the Police Commission meeting at the end of the meeting. Cortez was unable to make the Human Rights Commission meeting for that month.

4. Minutes Approval

MOTION: Conover moved, seconded by Roseta, to approve the April 13, 2021 CRB minutes as presented. The motion passed unanimously.

5. Case Review: Additional Community Impact Case Investigation Allegations of Unbecoming Conduct and Integrity

Pitcher pulled up a slideshow entitled: “Community Impact Case Review: Review of Allegations of Unbecoming Conduct and a Lack of Integrity”.

- I. Community Impact Case: Process Overview
 - Lots of community interest from varying perspectives, lots of force reports.
 - Incident Reviews to perform high-level look at weekend overall, with certain incidents extracted for further scrutiny.
 - Resulting investigations – reviewed December 2020:
 - Incident reviews offering overview of events of May 29, May 30, and May 31.
 - Incident review/catch-all for complaints about Chief-level decisions (outside their jurisdiction).
 - Six allegations of misconduct investigations.
 - Two incident reviews of specific incidents, four inquiries, and one service complaint.
 - Two inquiry investigations arose out of CRB discussion in December 2020.
 - Review of video from the weekend was still occurring in December and into January 2021.
 - This investigation resulted and was presumptively treated as part of the community impact case.
- II. Summary of Facts
 - Officer A and Officer B were assigned to crowd control throughout the weekend of May 29-31, 2020.
 - Officer A was assigned a pepper ball launcher throughout the weekend, and their use of pepper ball was investigated separate to this (and reviewed by the CRB).
 - Officer B was assigned a 40mm sponge-round launcher on the night of May 29, and their use of that tool was reviewed in a separate inquiry. Officer B was assigned a pepper ball launcher for the rest of the weekend; their use of the pepper ball was documented in police reports. Officer B was also interviewed for part of the investigation into Officer A’s use of pepper ball.
 - The recording that gave rise to this investigation was inadvertently recorded by Officer A’s body-worn camera on the night of May 30. It was discovered during the review of all EPD video related to officer response to demonstrations.
 - The video included the officers describing their use of force in a casual manner, and their descriptions of their uses of force on the video differed from the accounts they gave in police reports and administrative interviews.
- III. Allegations
 - Officer A:
 - #1: that Officer A engaged in conduct that brought the department into disrepute when they mocked the use of force on community members.
 - #2: that Officer A engaged in conduct that compromised their honesty when they gave a materially different account for their force on a community member in an administrative interview than they did when speaking informally.
 - Officer B:
 - #3: that Officer B engaged in conduct that brought the department into disrepute when they mocked the use of force on community members.
 - #4: that officer B engaged in conduct that compromised their honesty when they stated that none of the people, they had shot over the weekend deserved it except one but justified all their uses of force on community members in police reports.
- IV. Preliminary Adjudications
 - Chain of Command: Sustained on all allegations.
 - Auditor’s Office: Sustained on all allegations.
 - Chief of Police: Sustained on all allegations.

V. CRB Discussion and Decision Points

Whalen thought these decisions were difficult. They agreed with the preliminary sustain and that officers on duty needed to be more aware of what they were saying. However, they could understand that in the totality of what went on (how many hours they worked and what was said to them) they were trying to relieve stress. Roseta and Conover agreed with that point.

Roseta noted that Pitcher had described the first allegation as “unbecoming conduct”, but the policy was around if their actions held the department in disrepute. They were unsure how the department could be held in disrepute without someone else from the public hearing. Roseta was unsure if the adjudications should be sustained, but officers should be aware that those actions were not ideal and were not condoned. They understood why the Chief would sustain the adjudications to enforce better behavior.

Conover mentioned that integrity being brought up could be career ending. Material fact and reporting had to be included for proof. The investigation and report done by the officers did not reflect what they had said in the car. They agreed that those things should not be said while in uniform. Conover was not in agreement with the integrity adjudication but could agree with the conduct adjudication being sustained.

Hames-Garcia mentioned that they were not aware of how many pepper balls were used, since they were not accounted for in the same way that bullets were. Pitcher told him that they tried to figure out how many were used based on how many pepper balls were ordered after the events. Nelson added that they had a great video and they thought there was a pretty accurate count of pepper balls that were used. Hames-Garcia mentioned that the lieutenant memo had a different description and amount of pepper balls used. They thought it was a weird discrepancy. Either way, there was many rounds used over the weekend.

Hames-Garcia thought these allegations came down to if the inconsistencies were in the report or in the squad car. They were assuming that their conversation was overexaggerated. Pitcher said that they had body camera footage showing how many rounds each of the officers deployed, but the statements made were concerning and they believed should have investigated again. They found that the report was more accurate than the conversation. He understood that when people were under a high level of stress, they made choices and said things they might not normally. However, Hames-Garcia thought there were deeper issues with what were said about how one individual deserved to be shot at with pepper balls.

Williams agreed with how callous some of the comments were. They were concerned with how casually some of those comments were made. Williams asked who found the footage and decided it should be investigated. Pitcher said that EPD had appointed a Quality Control person to go through the footage and flag issues. Williams always appreciated when the departments brought cases forward. They were glad that their body cameras were on and emphasized that when on duty cameras should always be on. Williams also wanted that footage to be made public but understood that was a Legislative issue.

Pitcher knew there were misunderstanding around officers being able to edit footage from their cameras. They reminded everyone that that was not possible. If anything like that was possible videos similar to the one they were looking at would have been edited or even deleted. Williams stated that being able to turn the camera off was a type of editing.

Cortez asked how accurate it was that in the lieutenant memo it said that Officer A was engaged in a private conversation. Pitcher responded that it was an important distinction. When talking to a co-worker away from the public would be private for most people, but officers had cameras on and might have different standards. Cortez believed that when someone was a public servant, some private things became public (like emails, conduct outside the office). They thought that for police officers being on duty was

not considered private. Cortez disagreed that this was a private conversation. The issue was not just about the department and how it was disrepute, but more deep-rooted issues. The public should have high expectations for their public servants.

Foltz thought that the way people spoke when they thought no one was listening could be very telling. In the case they were looking at, it revealed an “us versus them” mentality. Even if done to relieve stress, it created an environment where those types of statements could be made.

The CRB agreed with the adjudication made sustaining allegation #1 on conduct for Officer A.

Foltz, Williams, Hames-Garcia, and Cortez agreed with the adjudication made sustaining allegation #2 on integrity for Officer A. Whalen, Conover, and Roseta did not agree.

The CRB agreed with the adjudication made sustaining allegation #3 on conduct for Officer B.

Foltz, Williams, Hames-Garcia, and Cortez agreed with the adjudication made sustaining allegation #4 on integrity for Officer B. Whalen, Conover, and Roseta did not agree.

The CRB agreed that the cases did not need to be re-opened.

6. Break

The CRB took a break between 6:39 p.m. - 6:46 p.m.

7. Training Topic: Employee Wellness and Support Following High-Stress Incidents

Deputy Chief Jepson was there that night to go over the CRB training topic. Pitcher said there were often circumstances, like the case they went over that night, where officers were in high-stress incidents. It would be beneficial for the Board to hear more about what officers were trained on. Deputy Chief Jepson shared that they were concerned after they heard the video from the case the CRB went over.

Deputy Chief Jepson wanted to have an open discussion where CRB members could ask questions.

Conover said that when going over the case members had talked about the culture of the department and how conversations like that affected it. She asked how they dealt with the fact that there were many conversations that were taking place that were similar when officers were off duty. Deputy Chief Jepson replied that they were all human and would say wrong things sometimes. Even though the officers were under stress, and might have been using humor to destress, they had a hard time dismissing those statements. Deputy Chief Jepson said that they were trying to make changes but did not want to make an example out of one case. They wanted there to be conversations and healthy dialogue within the department when there were problems. Making those types of changes to the culture would take time.

Hames-Garcia asked what tools were available now or would be in the future for officer mental health. Deputy Chief Jepson responded that mental health issues were a big issue with police officers. One of the biggest hurdles they faced was the stigma that officers had to suppress whatever they saw and not deal with how it made them feel. They had fought for an Employee Assistance program, which was about to be finalized by the City. It had a 24-hour police suicide line that was staffed by former police officers. Deputy Chief Jepson said that the most difficult part was getting people to understand that those supports were there for them and there was nothing wrong with using them. They also wanted to do mandatory annual mental health check-ins to help get rid of the stigma.

Foltz hoped, as a community member, to see them move towards a Care and Wellness centered model of public safety at-large. They stated it would be impossible to reach that goal if they did not prioritize

officer mental health. Foltz asked if they had staffing flexibility to allow officers time after a hard response. It would be hard to not bury issues if they had to continue working. Deputy Chief Jepson told them that they discussed this issue, and they were talking with leadership groups on how they can help. One way to help would be having flexible staff.

Cortez mentioned that officer health also involved their families and communities. They thanked Deputy Chief Jepson for the language they used and for saying that wellness was an investment in their community. They asked what the correlation was between officer wellness and a care centric approach. Deputy Chief Jepson responded that the officer and community relationship could be seen as a parallel to parenting. They said that officers being in the right mind-set was a direct correlation to doing their job right. When officers interacted with someone, it was usually one of the worst days of that person's life. Not being able to cope with situations could lead to bad decision making, saying the wrong thing, or taking the bait when someone else was going through a tough situation and lashing out.

Conover inquired into what one thing they would implement to help with mental health. Deputy Chief Jepson replied that it would change a lot if they implemented mandatory mental health check-ins and had unlimited access to mental health care for all first responders.

Hames-Garcia appreciated that the measures talked about were preventative, not reactive. They mentioned a study they saw on officer recruitment about how they advertised openings. One was more action packed; the other, puzzle solving. The different kinds of advertisements brought in drastically different types of applicants. Deputy Chief Jepson was involved in hiring and thought finding the balance of those two types of people was the best outcome. The ideal candidate would be someone with high emotional intelligence who could empathize with the community and be patient.

8. Auditor Report

Pitcher mentioned that the Ad-Hoc Committee would be reporting to City Council on Monday May 17, 2021. They were excited to start fixing some of the problems the Committee pointed out. The annual report would be ready to present to the City Council before their August break. Typically, the CRB report was done at the same time. That had already been drafted and just had to be looked at by the Board.

Pitcher thanked the Board for their patience while the Community Impact Case continued. Pitcher reminded everyone that Mark Gissiner would be back for their June meeting because they would be reviewing the Rodrigues case, which Gissiner had overseen.

City Council had done interviews for the new CRB members. They would vote on the new members in June.

9. Closing Comments

Hames-Garcia reported that the Police Commission was visited by Senator Manning. They talked about the bills that were currently in the Legislature. The Commission also finished their review of the pepper ball policy and gave their recommendations to the Chief.

Foltz thanked Roseta for their continued work with the Ad-Hoc Committee and for volunteering for to help with the CRB draft response. Conover agreed.

Whalen thanked everyone for a great discussion that night and for Deputy Chief Jepson for coming to their meeting.

Roseta was happy with the training topic from that night. They were very impressed by Deputy Chief Jepson.

Conover liked doing the single case reviews. They thought that doing two might work better if they were meeting in person.

10. Adjournment

Williams adjourned the meeting at 7:39 p.m.

(Minutes recorded by Lydia Dysart)

Office of the Police Auditor
May 2021 Closed Case Report

Incident type: IA Investigation
Status: Completed
Received date: Feb 28, 2020
Class/sub-class: Allegation of Criminal Conduct / Conformance to Laws

Disposition: Dismissed-Other

While in custody at a jail, an inmate reported that she had been raped by an unidentified male Eugene Police officer sometime in 2017. The custodial agency completed a report and forwarded it to EPD Internal Affairs for follow up.

EPD asked Oregon State Police to investigate as a criminal matter. During that investigation, RP recanted her allegation and stated that she was not the victim of sexual assault by any EPD officers.

Incident type: IA Investigation
Status: Completed
Received date: May 28, 2020
Class/sub-class: Allegation of Criminal Conduct / Conformance to Laws

Disposition: Resigned during Investigation

A person reported to an EPD supervisor that an officer had engaged in conduct that, if true, would constitute official misconduct on duty. EPD asked Salem Police Department to investigate the matter. The officer resigned effective 6/10/20, and the matter was referred to the Lane County DA for prosecution. Prosecution still pending as of 5/7/21. Administratively closed - resigned during investigation.

Incident type: IA Investigation
Status: Completed
Received date: Aug 12, 2020
Class/sub-class: Allegation of Misconduct / Use of Force

Categories: Riots/Protests Related

Disposition: Within Policy

Excessive Use of Force on May 29, 2020 and May 31, 2020.

Allegations:

As to Officer A:

1. 800 Use of Force: That Officer A used force in excess of that which was reasonably necessary under the totality of the circumstances when he fired hundreds of PepperBall rounds into crowds of demonstrators on May 29, 2020.
2. 804 Pepperball Projectiles: That Officer A used PepperBall projectiles under conditions where they could affect innocent bystanders on May 29, 2020.

3. 800 Use of Force: That Officer A used force in excess of that which was reasonably necessary under the totality of the circumstances when he fired PepperBall rounds at a demonstrator at or near 10th Avenue and Washington St. on May 31, 2020.

Allegations:

Use of Force - 800 Use of Force - Within Policy - Nov 30, 2020
Use of Force - 804 PepperBall Projectiles - Within Policy - Nov 30, 2020
Use of Force - 800 Use of Force - Within Policy - Nov 30, 2020

As to Officer B:

1. 800 Use of Force: That Officer B used force in excess of that which was reasonably necessary under the totality of the circumstances when he fired hundreds of PepperBall rounds into crowds of demonstrators on May 29, 2020.

2. 804 PepperBall Projectiles: That Officer B used PepperBall projectiles under conditions where they could affect innocent bystanders on May 29, 2020.

Allegations:

Use of Force - 800 Use of Force - Within Policy - Nov 30, 2020
Use of Force - 804 PepperBall Projectiles - Within Policy - Nov 30, 2020

Incident type: IA Investigation
Status: Completed
Received date: Oct 15, 2020
Class/sub-class: Allegation of Misconduct / Conduct
Disposition: Unfounded

Allegation:

103.4.3 Integrity: That an Officer conducted himself in a manner that compromised his honesty when, knowing what paperwork was required for a time trade and that he had not asked another Officer to complete the proper paperwork, he misrepresented that the paperwork was properly completed.

Allegations:

Conduct - 103.4.3 Integrity - Unfounded - Apr 26, 2021

Incident type: IA Investigation
Status: Completed
Received date: Nov 11, 2020
Class/sub-class: Allegation of Misconduct / Performance
Disposition: Unfounded

An Officer was dispatched as the primary Officer to a disorderly subject. The Officer's delayed response had a direct impact on another Officer's safety as the delay caused him to take enforcement action alone. The Officer as the primary officer, also failed to investigate the call and allowed another Officer to handle the incident.

Allegations:

1. 103.5.19 Neglect of Duty - It is alleged that an Officer failed to respond to a dispatched call within a reasonable amount of time.
2. 103.5.14 Unsatisfactory Performance - It is alleged that an Officer failed to perform the required tasks associated with his position.

Allegations:

Performance - 103.5.19 Neglect of Duty - Within Policy - Apr 26, 2021
Performance - 103.5.14 Unsatisfactory Performance - Unfounded - 4/26/21

Incident type: IA Investigation
Status: Completed
Received date: Jan 28, 2021
Class/sub-class: Allegation of Misconduct / Conduct
Disposition: Sustained

Allegations:

1. 103.4.1 Judgment - Records Specialist used poor judgment when offering a prescription narcotic to an on-duty officer.
2. 103.5.9.g Conduct - Records Specialist failed to foster a respectful work environment when sharing photos from an online dating platform at work.
3. 103.5.9.g Conduct - Records Specialist failed to foster a respectful work environment when reviewing the patrol lineup in an attempt to determine whom she had smelled earlier.

Allegations:

Performance - 103.4.1 Judgment - Sustained - Apr 7, 2021
Conduct - 103.5.9 Conduct - Sustained - Apr 7, 2021
Conduct - 103.5.9 Conduct - Sustained - Apr 7, 2021

Incident type: IA Investigation
Status: Completed
Received date: Feb 8, 2021
Class/sub-class: Allegation of Misconduct / Performance
Disposition: Within Policy.

Allegations for Officer A:

1. 103.4.1 Judgment: That Officer A did not exercise good judgment at the scene of the fire.
2. 103.5.14 Unsatisfactory Performance: That Officer A did not perform the tasks associated with his official position when he failed to adequately supervise his recruit officer.

3. 1203 Body-Worn Video: That Officer A failed to follow the policy on Body-Worn Video by:
 - a. Failing to record this incident for its entire duration (1203.7.1)
 - b. Stopping his recording more than once, before the incident was complete, without recording a reason why (1203.7.6)

Allegations:

- Performance - 103.4.1 Judgment - Within Policy - May 6, 2021
- Performance - 103.5.14 Unsatisfactory Performance - Within Policy - 5/6/21
- Performance - 1203 Body Worn Video - Within Policy - May 6, 2021

Allegation for Officer B:

1. 103.4.1 Judgment: That Officer B did not exercise good judgment at the scene of the fire.

Allegations:

- Performance - 103.4.1 Judgment - Within Policy - May 6, 2021
-

Incident type: IA Investigation

Status: Completed

Received date: Feb 17, 2021

Class/sub-class: Allegation of Misconduct / Performance

Disposition: Unfounded

Officers responded regarding a call initially described as an overdose, but later recognized as carbon monoxide poisoning from a running gas generator within a two-story residence.

Officer A:

1. 103.4.1 Judgment: That Officer A failed to use good judgment when he entered the residence.
2. 103.4.1 Judgment: That Officer A failed to use good judgment when he allowed officers to detain the residents inside the residence, causing all involved to suffer continued carbon monoxide exposure
3. 103.5.14 Unsatisfactory Performance: that Officer A failed to perform the tasks associated with his rank when he inadequately supervised the officers on scene.
4. 322 Search and Seizure: That Officer A directed the detention of the involved residents without reasonable suspicion, in violation of their constitutional rights.

Allegations:

- Performance - 103.4.1 Judgment - Within Policy - May 6, 2021
- Performance - 103.4.1 Judgment - Within Policy - May 6, 2021
- Performance - 103.5.14 Unsatisfactory Performance - Within Policy -5/6/21
- Constitutional Rights - 322 Search and Seizure - Unfounded - May 6, 2021

Officer B:

1. Judgment: That Officer B failed to use good judgment when he entered the residence.
2. Performance: that Officer B failed to perform the tasks associated with his position as an FTO when he directed his recruit officer in an unsafe manner.

Allegations:

Performance - 103.4.1 Judgment - Within Policy - May 6, 2021
Performance - 103.5.14 Unsatisfactory Performance - Within Policy 5/6/21

Incident type: IA Investigation

Status: Completed

Received date: Mar 9, 2021

Class/sub-class: Allegation of Criminal Conduct / Conformance to Laws

Disposition: Unfounded

Officer A reported finding \$500 cash in his assigned patrol vehicle that may have been related to some property/cash earlier found by Officer B in the same vehicle.

Criminal Review conducted by Albany PD; no evidence of a crime.

Office of the Police Auditor

May 2021 Open Case Report

Allegations of Misconduct

Incident type: IA Investigation

Status: Active

Received date: May 4, 2021

Class/sub-class: Allegation of Misconduct / Conduct

Internal review and update of an Officer's background investigation. During the review, some discrepancies in the Officer's answers were discovered. A follow-up recorded interview with Officer found potentially untruthful answers during two different background investigations and the updated interview

103.5.1 Truthfulness: that an Officer was untruthful in his statements related to his answers on personal history questionnaires.

Incident type: IA Investigation

Status: Active

Received date: May 6, 2021

Class/sub-class: Allegation of Misconduct / Courtesy

Disposition:

RP filed a complaint alleging that EPD officers misapplied the "trespass" law to a person for simply not being able to wear a mask inside a business. See RP's email and attached videos for complete details of the incident.

Additional complaint/correspondence received from RP involved in the incident.

1. 103.5.8(a) and (d) Courtesy - that the Officer was not respectful in his interaction with RP.

Inquiries

Incident type: Supervisor Action

Status: Active

Received date: May 3, 2021

Class/sub-class: Inquiry

Disposition:

RP works with St. Vincent Veterans Services and is inquiring into an incident involving an African American veteran who reported a bias crime. His understanding is that no police report was generated, and nothing came of the incident. RP would like to get this clarified as to be able to help the gentleman.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: May 6, 2021
Class/sub-class: Inquiry
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP was upset with a traffic stop of his girlfriend that an officer initiated after she had returned home.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: May 10, 2021
Class/sub-class: Inquiry
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP is upset that officers refused to intervene in an incident in which a person who was watching his dog refused to return it and assaulted RP. RP stated that officers told him the dog was a civil issue and then would not allow him to press charges for the woman assaulting him.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: May 15, 2021
Class/sub-class: Inquiry
Disposition:

RP reported an incident at her home in which she feels the officer did a poor job of dealing with an assault by a roommate, who then robbed her of her cell phone. The other party was not cited or arrested for the assault.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: May 19, 2021
Class/sub-class: Inquiry
Disposition:

RP complained that officers came to their home, distracted the RP with strange comments, and would not leave.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: May 24, 2021
Class/sub-class: Inquiry
Disposition: Dismissed-o/s jurisdic

RP reported that officers came to their home for a welfare check, requested by the RP's daughter, and that the daughter's information was untrue. RP stated that when they were taken into custody, they were not treated with care.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: May 25, 2021
Class/sub-class: Inquiry
Disposition:

RP feels targeted by EPD because her neighbor called in a false claim of harassment.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: May 27, 2021
Class/sub-class: Inquiry
Disposition:

The Auditor opened an inquiry regarding a conversation between RP and an Officer that is alleged to have occurred at RP's residence in May of 2020.

Service Complaints

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: May 2, 2021
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance

Categories: Riots/Protests Related

Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

Anonymous is angry that officers in the parking lot of EPD headquarters did not warn citizens who were in the lot that a BLM protest was about to start which caught them in the middle of it and put his child in danger.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: May 3, 2021
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance
Disposition:

RP is very concerned about the speeding and poor driving in her neighborhood. There has not been any change no matter how many times she complains in 5 years.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: May 3, 2021
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Courtesy
Disposition: Dismissed-Other

RP is concerned that when she tried to report a crime being committed by light beams, the call taker was not willing to take her report.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: May 4, 2021
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Courtesy
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

Officers responded to a neighbor dispute that was reportedly active and contentious when they arrived. At the conclusion of the call, all parties were warned regarding dog at large and prohibited noise.

RP was one of the involved parties and contacted dispatch to file a complaint after the officers left. RP relayed that he believed the officers were not entirely educated on various statutes and went on to say that he attempted to trick one officer to test his knowledge as it related to the statute related to Harassment. RP relayed that he felt the officers were unreasonable and that he was cutoff during the conversation and that he was told to be quiet and listen. He characterized the officers as aggressive and said he felt as though they were acting in a fashion that was meant to elicit an emotional response leading to an incident of resisting arrest.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: May 4, 2021
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance
Disposition:

RP was upset that a supervisor was rude with her and would not let her talk. RP also felt that she was getting the run around about what is happening with her case. One officer told her the case was suspended, and another told her it was sent to the DA. The DA claims not to have it.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: May 7, 2021
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP is tired of being pulled over to be questioned about his wife and in-laws. RP is not a criminal and has never been in trouble with the law but still gets pulled over regularly to be questioned about things he has no knowledge of. RP would like the harassment to stop so he can get his life back on track.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: May 10, 2021
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Courtesy
Disposition:

RP requested a call for service she placed to 911 about a psychotic man driving erratically in her neighborhood be reviewed. RP felt the call taker may need some education in how to question people who are calling in a concern. The call taker argued with RP about the cars being driven and cut off RP when she tried to give the plate number. She did not feel it was helpful to be argued with and then be asked for detailed

information.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: May 12, 2021
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Service level
Disposition:

RP complained that when they reported a trespassing and indecent exposure incident, the call taker said that police were coming but they did not show up.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: May 13, 2021
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Service level

Categories: Prohibited Camping - Parks

Disposition:

RP was referred to the Auditor's office with a concern about a homeless man sleeping in a park at night. RP and his neighbors are concerned about the safety of their neighborhood with this man who is reported to be a felon being in the park. On 5/12/21 RP called EPD when he noticed officers in the park for another matter to see if they could address this ongoing issue when they had finished up what they were doing. RP then noted the officer left without contacting the man. RP called EPD back and was told by the call taker they must have went to different calls, and when RP got upset and threatened to take matters into his own hands the call taker hung up on him. RP is fed up with getting no service from EPD for this issue.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: May 18, 2021
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance
Disposition:

RP felt he was singled out by an officer for a speeding citation due to the liberal stickers on his car. RP was driving with traffic and was going slower than the other lane.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: May 19, 2021
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Courtesy

Categories: COVID

Disposition:

RP reported an Officer refused to put on mask and speak to RP, refused to give any personal information when asked, and got very rude when asked why he was not wearing his mask in public.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: May 19, 2021
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance
Disposition: Dismissed-EE Not Identif

An Anonymous caller reported a police vehicle driving erratically. Driving in and out of traffic not paying attention to bicycles or cars turning into the hwy. RP was very unhappy with what she saw.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: May 25, 2021
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Service level
Disposition:

RP has been trying since February 15th to get an update from an officer about his case in which his truck was burnt to the ground. RP has left numerous text messages (text was the way they had been communicating up to Feb 15th) and a couple of voice messages on the officer's police line without a response.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: May 26, 2021
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance
Disposition:

Anonymous reported an officer who tailgated and followed RP for quite a distance.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: May 31, 2021
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance
Disposition:

RP was concerned that when she and her boyfriend tried to get emergency help for an elderly person who had fallen outside her home and could not stand up, the call taker was dismissive because the man was conscious. The call taker declared it was not an emergency and it appears from RP's narrative, did not send help. RP feels that the dispatch person should never dismiss someone who thinks that they are in an emergency.

Policy Complaints

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: May 5, 2021
Class/sub-class: Policy Complaint
Disposition:

RP was in a car accident in September of 2020 and the person who hit her was not cited. She has learned the EPD does not cite anyone who hits someone else. RP would like to speak to someone to understand why EPD has this policy.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: May 12, 2021
Class/sub-class: Policy Complaint
Disposition:

RP emailed the Auditor with a concern about a conflict of interest with EPD employees accepting free meals with local businesses, and then posting the business on their web page. RP referenced the city of Eugene handbook and Administrative Policy Manual to note that he feels EPD is creating a perception of bias.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: May 13, 2021
Class/sub-class: Policy Complaint
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP is concerned about the Thin Blue Line flag he noticed in front of Police Headquarters today. RP feels it is highly inappropriate as it is a divisive symbol.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: May 17, 2021
Class/sub-class: Policy Complaint
Disposition: Dismissed-Other

RP asked a question in Ask Eugene about police drugging women at bars and stealing their medical information.

Incident Reviews

Incident type: Incident Review
Status: Completed
Received date: May 4, 2021
Class/sub-class: Incident Review / Use of Force
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP reported an incident where neighbors called police because she and her boyfriend were arguing. RP had gone to the bedroom when she heard her boyfriend start yelling and came out to 3 officers on her boyfriend. When she got upset and began yelling at the officers, they both ended up handcuffed but were not arrested for anything.

Incident type: Incident Review
Status: Completed
Received date: May 7, 2021
Class/sub-class: Incident Review / Conduct

Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

Auditor-initiated review into comments made by a person about behavior by EPD officers during a series of calls for service in May 2020.

Incident type: Incident Review
Status: Active
Received date: May 14, 2021
Class/sub-class: Incident Review
Disposition:

RP reported that officers did not respond adequately when she and her roommate had a series of physical disputes over the course of a night.

Incident type: Incident Review
Status: Active
Received date: May 27, 2021
Class/sub-class: Incident Review

Categories: **LECC Reporting**

Disposition:

RP contacted the Auditor with a concern that a student of his had brought to him. His student was crossing 6th near the Beergarden with her boyfriend. She stated that the light was green, but the pedestrian signal hadn't changed, and that she and her boyfriend crossed after looking for cars. They were then issued citations for a pedestrian violation. After they'd been stopped, additional officers came to the scene, and when they stated that it felt like profiling, a supervisor came to the scene and informed them that it wasn't profiling.

Police Commendations

The Eugene Police Department Commendations from citizens for May 2021 maybe found at the link below.

<https://www.eugene-or.gov/2763/Commendations>