



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.

Meeting Agenda: Civilian Review Board
Tuesday, March 8, 2016 - 5:30 p.m.
Atrium Building, 99 West 10th Avenue, Sloat Room
Contact: Vicki Cox, 682-5016

(A Light dinner will be available for board members beginning at 5:00 pm.)

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>TIME (Starting)</u>
1. Agenda and Materials Review	5 minutes (5:30 pm)
2. Minutes Approval (Minutes from February 2016 Meeting)	5 minutes (5:35 pm)
3. Public Comment	10 minutes (5:40 pm)
4. Comments from Board Members, Human Rights Commission Liaison and Police Commission Liaison	10 minutes (5:50 pm)
5. Training Topic: Blue Team /. Use of Force Reporting	20 minutes (6:00 pm)
6. Break	10 Minutes (6:20 pm)
7. Case Review: Allegation filed by Eugene Police Employees' Association that supervisor failed to properly respond to employee's request for cover.	30 minutes (6:30 pm)
8. Auditor Report	10 minutes (7:00 pm)
9. Adjourn	(7:10 pm)

MINUTES

Civilian Review Board
Bascom Room—Eugene Public Library—100 West Tenth Avenue
Eugene, Oregon

February 9, 2016
5:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Bernadette Conover, Chair; Eric Von Houten, Vice Chair; Maurice Denner, Lindsey Foltz, Heather Marek, Steven McIntire, Chris Wig, Civilian Review Board members; Vicki Cox, Mark Gissiner, Police Auditor's Office; Lt. Carolyn Mason, Sgt. Dale Dawson, Sgt. Larry Crompton, Eugene Police Department; Bonnie Souza, Human Rights Commission liaison; Dahlia Bazzaz, Bobby Jones, Majeska Seese-Green, guests.

ABSENT: None.

Chair Conover convened the CRB at 5:30 p.m.

I. AGENDA AND MATERIALS REVIEW

Ms. Marek requested that agenda item 7, discussion about audio and/or video recording of meetings, be moved to an earlier time in the agenda to allow sufficient time for the CRB to discuss the topic.

Ms. Conover explained Eugene Police Department (EPD) officers who would present the training and participate in the case review were expecting those topics to be discussed in the order listed in the agenda and may leave after those agenda items were completed. It would be unfair to revise the agenda order.

Ms. Marek emphasized her preference to revise the agenda.

Ms. Marek moved that the training be flipped with the discussion about audio and/or video recordings. The motion died for lack of a second.

Ms. Conover deemed the agenda approved.

II. MINUTES APPROVAL—January 16, 2016

Mr. McIntire offered the following correction:

Page 2, paragraph 7, sentence 2 should read: He said that he didn't think that the community ~~understood~~ **knows about** the purpose of the CRB and its role.

Mr. Wig offered the following correction:

Page 2, paragraph 7, sentence 3 should read: He informed the board that ~~he and~~ Mr. Van Houten often explains the CRB's role as the interface between the auditor and the public, **and Mr. Wig supported Mr. Van Houten's statements.**

Ms. Marek offered the following corrections:

Page 3, paragraph 9, sentence 3 should read: Ms. Marek informed Mr. Denner that the Civil Liberties Defense Center could provide valuable insight from the ~~law enforcement~~ **civil rights** perspective.

Page 7, paragraph 3, sentence 4 should read: She also reiterated the issue of microphone muting especially given the concerns with Miranda Rights.

Ms. Conover offered the following corrections:

Page 3, paragraph 2, sentence 3 should read: She said that she had asked Ms. Pitcher the same question regarding commenting during the meeting and had also met with Ms. ~~Conover~~ **Pitcher**.

Mr. McIntire moved that the January 12, 2016 Civilian Review Board minutes be approved as corrected. Noting no objections, Ms. Conover deemed the January 12, 2016 Civilian Review Board minutes approved as corrected.

III. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Van Houten called for public comment.

Bobby Jones expressed concern that there was no person of color on the CRB. He had been born and raised in Lane County and had been profiled regularly since 1971. He did not know what avenue to follow to express his concerns. He was concerned that Eugene was returning to the 1960's where law enforcement agencies worked together and complaints were often thrown out of court. He was still being profiled and was fearful of law enforcement personnel for several reasons. His son was murdered by law enforcement. He asked what he should do if he was caught in a situation where he was detained by the police. He needed help when authority was a problem. When he was pulled over when he was driving, he felt threatened and needed to know who he could contact.

Majeska Seese-Green noted she was recording tonight's CRB meeting. She hoped the CRB would decide to do audio recordings of future meetings. Having written minutes only was a step backwards. The Police Commission went to audio recordings a few years ago, which was also a step backwards. At the January 2016 meeting, she had provided information to the CRB about *A Community Together*, an organization she was affiliated with. The group had changed its name from *Police and Community Together (P.A.C.T.)* to *A Community Together* in 2009, and she was surprised that staff and CRB members had not picked up on the mistake in the minutes. She asked if this was intentional on the part of staff and said it appeared the CRB had blown her and Carol Berg Caldwell off since 2009.

IV. COMMENTS FROM BOARD MEMBERS, HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION LIAISON AND POLICE COMMISSION LIAISON

Mr. McIntire reported the Police Commission was reviewing several issues, including officers' muted mikes, and was looking at policies related to searches and storage of prisoners' property. He thanked Mr. Jones for his comments this evening. He noted the CRB had asked the City Council to reach out to minority groups when recruiting police officers.

Mr. Wig thanked Mr. Jones for sharing his story with the CRB. He said Mr. Jones was not the first person to raise this issue, which continued to be a problem in the community. He noted the Police Auditor reported to the City Council and not the Chief of Police, adding people should contact the Police Auditor's office if they felt they had been profiled. Although the CRB could not fix the profiling problem, he hoped Mr. Jones felt heard.

Mr. Van Houten thanked Mr. Jones for his comments this evening, and hoped the issues Mr. Jones identified could be fixed. Mr. Van Houten was intrigued by a newspaper article that reported the Portland Police Bureau had been asked to develop earlier interventions for officers involved in fatal shootings. He noted a Seaside Police officer had been shot and killed last week.

Mr. Denner concurred with Mr. Van Houten's comments. He said an article featured in National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement (NACOLE) publication, *Use of Force*, had been informative. He asked that the article be forwarded to CRB members.

Ms. Foltz thanked Mr. Jones for his comments this evening. She noted Mr. Wig and Mr. McIntire had valid points. She appreciated the variety of perspectives displayed by CRB members.

Ms. Marek echoed CRB members' appreciation to Mr. Jones. She suggested the CRB should have a training on profiling. She thanked Ms. Seese-Green for sharing her concerns that the January 2016 minutes did not accurately identify the name of the group *A Community Together*. She had not attended the last HRC meeting due to illness. She had reviewed the CRB bylaws, which under Article 7, provided a way for community members to participate in CRB discussions and she encouraged CRB members to invite community members to participate. She thanked the CRB for its willingness to consider audio recordings of its meeting which she thought was important for transparency and accountability, and for the public to trust the CRB process.

Ms. Conover thanked Mr. Jones for his comments tonight, which echoed concerns shared by others in the community. She noted CRB member Marisa Mendoza had been replaced by Dr. Snell Fontus in 2009, and the balance Dr. Fontus brought to the CRB was lost when he left the CRB in 2014. There were currently two open positions on the CRB and she encouraged Mr. Jones and other community members to apply for them. The diversity of opinion they could bring to the CRB was highly valued. She shared Mr. Van Houten's comments regarding the death of the Seaside Police officer.

V. TRAINING TOPIC: CRISIS INTERVENTION TRAINING

Lt. Carolyn Mason distributed a handout entitled *Lane County Regional Crisis Intervention Team Training*, and offered a *Crisis Intervention Training (CIT)*. She had 20+ years of experience with EPD and joined the EPD Internal Affairs Unit in January 2016. She reviewed the history of the CIT in Eugene, noting she had been the CIT commander since its inception in 2008. As of September 2015, 100 percent of EPD's sworn officers had completed the CIT training, and non-sworn EPD personnel who worked as 9-1-1 dispatchers and call takers also participated in the training. The plan was to have all sworn officers in Lane County complete the training. Through the CIT program, EPD partnered with the National Alliance on Mental Illness (NAMI), Lane County Behavioral Health, Lane County Health and Human Services, the Lane County District Attorney, the Vet Center, Crisis Assistance Helping Out On The Streets (CAHOOTS) and local hospitals to

serve people in crisis. EPD staff would attend a national best practices training in Chicago in April 2016.

In response so Mr. McIntire, Lt. Mason said military veterans served as teachers in the CIT trainings. She noted the success rates of de-escalation efforts were difficult to track and she was working on developing a valid method to measure those efforts.

VI. BREAK

The CRB took a short break.

VII. CASE REVIEW: ALLEGATION THAT SUPERVISOR FAILED TO PROPERLY AUDIT TEMPORARY EVIDENCE LOCKERS

Ms. Gissiner offered a PowerPoint presentation entitled *Case Summary—Civilian Review Board—February 9, 2016* and facilitated a discussion on the case before the CRB.

Summary of Facts

- The Auditor's Office received a complaint that the temporary evidence lockers were not being properly audited. The complaint was initially classified as an inquiry while a preliminary investigation took place.
- The preliminary investigation showed that there was an audit of the lockers in October 2014, and that no other audit took place until June 2015. The preliminary investigation also indicated that there were items in the temporary evidence lockers that had been stored for more than 5 days (in violation of policy).
- EPD policy required that the lockers will be audited quarterly.
- The complaint was reclassified to an allegation of misconduct.
- The policy requiring Supervisor A to perform quarterly audits of the temporary evidence lockers was effective at the beginning of 2014. In the six quarters following the enactment of the policy, Supervisor A conducted two audits.
- Some of the violations noted in the June 2015 audit were also present during the October 2014 audit.
- Supervisor A attended a training on property and evidence handling, which included training on audits, inventories, and management of temporary evidence lockers.
- Supervisor A stated during the investigation that the October 2014 audit had resulted in an email directive to those with access to the lockers to address the violations. The investigation indicated that Supervisor A did not follow up to ensure the violations were resolved.

Allegations

- Evidence and Property Handling—that Supervisor A failed to manage the temporary evidence lockers, including failure to perform quarterly audits of the lockers, as directed by policy.

Recommended Adjudication

- Property and Evidence Handling
 - EPD chain of command: Sustained
 - Auditor's Office: Sustained
 - Chief's Adjudication: Sustained

Issues for CRB Discussion

- Complaint Intake and Classification
 - Anonymously reported
 - Classification: Allegation of Misconduct (reclassified from Inquiry following preliminary investigation)
- Complaint Investigation and Monitoring
 - Mr. McIntire asked if other allegations, including competence, had been considered. He noted the written report was well done.
 - Ms. Conover said Internal Affairs (IA) and the Police Auditor's office worked together on this investigation. She asked if competence had been part of the investigation.
 - Ms. Gissiner said from an accountability perspective, officers involved in evidence and property handling followed the procedure used by their predecessors.
 - Mr. Denner noted people who had previously managed the temporary evidence lockers had not been interviewed.
 - Sgt. Dawson said no one clearly understood what was involved in performing complete audits of the lockers. He had reviewed the applicable policy and determined no precedent for performing the audits had been established.
 - In response to Ms. Conover, Lt. Mason said temporary lockers were not used by EPD when it was located at city hall. The lockers were first used after the EPD move to the current location on Country Club Road.
- Relevant Department Policies and Practices
 - 804—Property and Evidence Handling
 - Ms. Conover questioned if the new policy related to temporary storage lockers was adequate.
 - Mr. Wig asked if the policy conformed to best practices.
 - Mr. Van Houten said there was no policy if it was not adhered to. He asked how temporary storage had been managed at city hall.
 - Sgt. Dawson said temporary storage lockers were not used when EPD was at city hall. Property and evidence was simply stored in work areas accessible only to EPD employees.
 - Mr. McIntire said there were system wide failures and asked who was responsible to ensure that the policy was adhered to. There appeared to be no accountability, which was a responsibility up the chain of command and of the officers.
 - Ms. Conover said the supervisor had the policy but had not enforced it.
 - Mr. Wig said the analyst from outside EPD who performed the most recent audit became familiar with the policy, knew how to perform an audit, and did a thorough job.
 - Ms. Foltz said there were concerns expressed from multiple directions and the supervisor had not observed those concerns.
 - Mr. Van Houten was frustrated by what happened but he understood the challenges of moving into a new building and having new policies. Some of the property that was stored improperly was property that had been lost or stolen, and it was not returned to the rightful owners.
 - Ms. Gissiner noted he had seen court cases overturned because property had not been handled properly.

- Ms. Foltz said the report emphasized the supervisor had not been adequately trained and had not used available resources.
 - Mr. Wig emphasized everyone who handled the property needed to be adequately trained.
 - Adjudication Recommendations
 - Mr. Denner was bothered by this complaint, noting the case suggested there was not adequate follow up. He pondered if this was consistent throughout EPD or unique to this complaint. He inquired if officers at the rank of sergeant and above were regularly evaluated, and if people received training as they moved from assignment to assignment. He referred to a book entitled *It's Your Ship: Management Techniques from the Best Damn Ship in the Navy* by Michael Abrashoff, which discussed management and trust issues, which were missing in the temporary handling of property and evidence in EPD. He suggested that EPD leadership consider the concepts presented in the book, noting that performance was not owned but held. He hoped the performance issues would be adequately addressed.
 - Ms. Marek agreed with Mr. Denner's comments.
 - Mr. McIntire said he did not have much confidence that the temporary storage of evidence and property would be handled properly in the future.
 - Mr. Denner suggested a solution would be to stop using the lockers.
 - Mr. Van Houten agreed with Mr. McIntire that the problem arose from a lack of ownership of the responsibilities, and that EPD could do a better job.
 - Ms. Gissiner asserted the integrity of the entire organization was impacted by EPD's failure to properly store and audit evidence and property. He hoped this adjudication would help improve the evidence and property storage function and be shared throughout the organization.
 - Ms. Foltz asked how EPD would proceed to ensure that the result of the investigation would lead to supervisors and other employees adhering to the applicable EPD policies.
 - Lt. Mason said the evidence storage lockers had been shut down and property permanently stored. She did know how the performance issues had been addressed.
 - Additional Comments/Concerns
 - There were no additional comments/concerns.

VIII. DISCUSSION ABOUT AUDIO AND/OR VIDEO RECORDING OF MEETINGS

Ms. Conover stated the CRB had previously discussed the cost of having both audio and video recordings of meetings.

Ms. Gissiner stated the minutes of CRB meetings were not verbatim. Verbatim transcriptions were expensive if paired with audio and video recordings. If CRB members had access to audio recordings, he would not authorize verbatim transcription, and would provide brief meeting minutes. He preferred to scan written minutes for information about Police Commission meetings, and did not want to watch a three hour video to find information about meetings. In response to

Ms. Foltz who expressed concern about minor discrepancies in minutes currently provided for CRB meetings, Ms. Gissiner iterated that verbatim transcription would be more expensive.

Ms. Marek disagreed with Ms. Gissiner. There were other boards that had both recordings of meetings and minutes. A recording could improve the accuracy of the minutes.

Ms. Conover understood the Police Commission had audio recordings of its meetings and staff prepared brief minutes. She was concerned if the CRB had audio recordings, the minutes would be minimal, and full transcripts would be costly for the city.

In response to Ms. Marek, Ms. Foltz thought verbatim transcripts could result in confidential information inadvertently discussed at a CRB meeting being disseminated to the public.

Ms. Gissiner noted Oregon had a strong Officer Bill of Rights, and audio recordings that disseminated confidential employee needed to be handled cautiously. He preferred reading minutes to listening to audio or viewing video recordings. He missed written minutes for the Police Commission.

Ms. Marek stated this was not the conversation the CRB should be having. The CRB had a civic allegiance to the public. The CRB bylaws, and policies and procedures allowed for both written minutes and recordings. The CRB should have both recordings and minutes.

Mr. Denner asked if having digital and/or audio recordings provided transparency. It was important to have an accurate record of CRB meetings that accurately reflected the Auditor's reports and the CRB's discussions.

Ms. Marek said the ACLU had asked to see the information in the packets CRB members received related to cases they reviewed, and the request had been denied. The CRB meetings were not confidential.

Ms. Conover said the public was always entitled to see what occurred at CRB meetings and she disagreed that cases were not discussed transparently. The CRB was doing what it was charged with doing.

Mr. Wig agreed Ms. Marek had valid points regarding transparency and preserving the public record. He also agreed with Ms. Gissiner's points about accountability. He suggested the City Council would be reluctant to listen to a lengthy recording to learn about a CRB decision. Having both an audio and written record would be desirable. It was important for the CRB to be accessible to the people. He thanked Ms. Marek for enlightening him on the issue.

Mr. Van Houten agreed more information could be made available to the public but there were laws and rules that prevented revealing confidential information. He was concerned about making decisions based on what a small subsection of the community wanted. There had not been a concern until now, voiced by a select few who did not represent the entire community. If the CRB meetings were recorded, written minutes would be abbreviated.

Ms. Gissiner stated the Police Commission and the HRC had written minutes in the past until they moved to digital recordings. The minutes currently prepared for the CRB provided more information than required by the Oregon Public Meetings Law.

Mr. McIntire said the guidelines and policies for recording CRB meetings could change, but he did not think that was necessary. He said the CRB had heard only from a couple of people and not from the public in general that an audio recording was important. There was not sufficient evidence to support the CRB requiring audio recordings. The CRB differed from other city boards and commissions and he did not want to lose that uniqueness. If the meetings were recorded, he questioned the need for minutes. He opined having both was redundant and wasteful.

Ms. Foltz said there were a multitude of issues and she did not think it was an either/or issue.

Mr. Van Houten moved that the CRB have all but the case review section of CRB meetings recorded via audio or video equipment. Ms. Marek offered a friendly amendment: The CRB continue to have minutes in addition to audio recordings. Ms. Foltz seconded the motion.

Mr. Denner asked if employees had the right to recover damages if employee performance was called into question during a public session. This crossed into labor law regarding release of confidential information.

In response to Ms. Conover, Mr. Van Houten agreed to withdraw the motion, Ms. Marek agreed to withdraw the friendly amendment and Ms. Foltz agreed to withdraw the second to the motion.

Mr. Van Houten, seconded by Mr. Denner, moved that CRB meetings be audio recorded in their entirety. Ms. Marek offered an amendment that CRB meetings would have detailed minutes in addition to audio recordings. Mr. Van Houten and Mr. Denner accepted the amendment to the motion. Ms. Foltz, Ms. Marek and Mr. Wig voted in favor of the motion, Ms. Conover, Mr. Denner and Mr. McIntire voted against the motion, and Mr. Van Houten abstained from voting. Ms. Conover stated the motion failed on the vote of 3:3:1.

Ms. Conover noted the meeting had gone past its scheduled adjournment time and called for a motion to extend the meeting time. There were no responses.

IX. AUDITOR REPORT

The Auditor Report was deferred to a future meeting.

X. ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 7:35 p.m.

(Recorded by Linda Henry)

Eugene Police Department

February 2016 Closed Case Review

Incident type: Internal Affairs
Status: Completed
Received date: Jul 9, 2015
Class/sub-class: Allegation of Criminal Conduct / Conformance to Laws
Disposition: Administratively Closed

A non-sworn employee sought advice on a Human Resources issue from Supervisor A. The employee indicated that they did not feel comfortable going to Human Resources or to the chain of command. The employee stated that a Supervisor B displayed bullying behavior, foul language and was made demeaning statements to employees.

The employee stated that they recorded conversations – knowing the recordings could not be used in the case as they were made without the knowledge of Supervisor B. Supervisor A admonished the employee and told the employee not to continue that behavior - that they could be the focus of a criminal investigation.

This criminal investigation into the potential unlawful recording without the knowledge of the second party has been suspended until an interview with the employee as a witness in a current IA investigation and/or separate intake interview regarding the employee's concerns.

ORS 165.540(c) Obtaining Contents of Communications - a person may not obtain or attempt to obtain the whole or any part of a conversation by means of any device, contrivance, machine or apparatus, whether electrical, mechanical, manual or otherwise, if not all participants in the conversation are specifically informed that their conversation is being obtained.

DA has no interest in pursuing a criminal case against the employee. Supervisor A conducted a non-disciplinary coaching about the behavior at intake.

Incident type: Internal Affairs
Status: Completed
Received date: Oct 19, 2015
Class/sub-class: Allegation of Criminal Conduct / Conduct
Disposition: Administratively Closed

A Marion County Sheriff Deputy forwarded information reported by an inmate obtained during a Prior In-Custody Sexual Assault Notification interview, which was part of the book-in process. The inmate reported to Marion County that she had been sexually assaulted by a Hispanic male City of Eugene police officer while restrained in a patrol car 15 years ago. She indicated that she had not previously reported the assault; reflecting on the assault causes her mental and emotional trauma.

Given the time frame alleged, the incident was administratively closed.

Eugene Police Department

February 2016 Open Case Report

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Feb 1, 2016
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP reported that an officer who responded to her assault left her in a state of medical shock and didn't recognize the signs. The officer made an assumption of who she was and didn't treat her as a person, and threatened to arrest her. RP felt the officer made the whole situation worse.

Incident type: IA Investigation
Status: Active
Received date: Feb 2, 2016
Class/sub-class: Allegation of Misconduct / Performance
Disposition:

An officer was dispatched to take an Animal Abuse 1 report. It was alleged that the officer failed to conduct an adequate investigation.

1. Performance 1101.1.B.9 - that an officer failed to take appropriate action or perform professionally when he investigated the report of animal abuse.

Allegations:

Performance - 1101.1.B.9 Unsatisfactory Performance

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Feb 4, 2016
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance
Disposition:

RP was upset that he was told by the 911 dispatch that if he called the non-emergency number the next day with his incident number he could make an appointment to speak with an officer to file a trespass report. When he called the non-emergency the call-taker began to ask him all these questions about the incident and then asked the same questions over and over. When he asked to speak with a desk Captain he was told one was not available. The whole conversation was not what the RP was led to believe would happen with the situation.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Feb 7, 2016
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Courtesy
Disposition:

RP reported two separate officers one a female another a male who were rude, arrogant and over bearing when ordering him from a crime scene that was not taped off as a crime scene.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Feb 8, 2016
Class/sub-class: Policy Complaint
Disposition:

RP contacted the Auditor's Office upset about the service her daughter received when she was hit from behind by a man with no license, and no insurance. The man spoke little English and refused to give a name. Even with giving the call taker the information of the unlicensed and uninsured driver her daughter was told that no officer would be sent. RP cannot believe that in the face of this criminal activity EPD refused to help her daughter.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Feb 8, 2016
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance
Disposition:

Anonymous complaint came in reporting an erratically driving patrol vehicle.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Feb 8, 2016
Class/sub-class: Inquiry
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP became upset that animal services contacted her about a sign she created and left on her front porch.

The sign posted on her porch said something along the lines of "an orange cat, wanted dead or alive" with a \$150 reward. She felt that she should not be contacted about someone else's concern and that she had not done anything wrong. After allowing her to share her frustrations it explained to her that animal services is responsible for following up to calls and the concern in this case was she was seeking an animal that was not hers and people were concerned what she planned to do with it.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Feb 9, 2016
Class/sub-class: Policy Complaint
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP had concerns about handicap parking at the Eugene Police Department. RP feels that the department is out of compliance for the number of handicap spaces in the private rear portion of the Police Headquarters facility.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Feb 9, 2016
Class/sub-class: Policy Complaint
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP reported that he feels that Eugene undercover narcotic officers have been following him back and forth to Springfield. RP also reported these officers use orange lifts up in the trees near his apartment and shine lights at his door.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Feb 9, 2016
Class/sub-class: Inquiry
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP filed an inmate request form alleging a hate crime against him in an EPD case and inquiring into follow up of this case.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Feb 9, 2016
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP was upset with an officer that came to her home in Veneta about midnight looking for a man she had been dating. RP was very cooperative with the officer allowing him to look through her home for the man, answering his questions and even texting him for the officer. Later about 2 am the officer left a voice message asking for the man's mother's name. RP did not return that call on the advice of a lawyer friend. Monday night at 11:30 pm the officer showed up again demanding to know why she hadn't called him back, telling her she needed to tell her friend she could be charged with hindering prosecution mentioning her DHS case, and telling her he's going to keep showing up. RP is upset that after being more than helpful the officer shows up late at night waking her children with his poor attitude.

Incident type: Incident Review
Status: Completed
Class/sub-class: Incident Review / Performance
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP called the Auditor's Office upset with how a welfare check on his 8 year old daughter was handled by an officer. RP's daughter had called him in Alaska screaming, upset, and then the line went dead. At the direction of DHS he requested the welfare check, instead of taking a report of how his daughter had been assaulted with a beer bottle by a minor neighbor, the officer called him and told him not to call his ex because of an un-served restraining order. The officer refused to answer questions about the welfare check.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Feb 10, 2016
Class/sub-class: Policy Complaint /
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP called inquiring if he could speak with a supervisor about a couple incidents in which EPD officers have come into the lobby of the center, handcuffed a couple of his patrons, and taken them away. No communication was made with the office or managers on site. RP is hoping to get some communication going so that management can be notified when officers are possibly going to be arresting someone as it has a chilling effect on his patrons.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Feb 10, 2016
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

While approaching a crash scene the woman was told by an officer on-scene that she could not proceed through the scene, and that she had to turn her vehicle around immediately to go the opposite direction. She took exception to having a flashlight shined in her eyes by the officer.

Incident type: Incident Review
Status: Active
Received date: Feb 11, 2016
Class/sub-class: Incident Review / Search and Seizure and Courtesy
Disposition:

RP said numerous officers had come to her trailer looking for the father of her child. She stated she denied entry to the officers to search as he was not there and her pit bull mix dog was inside. RP stated the main officer right at her door said something similar to "I will make sure you are cited and tagged" related to prohibited camping. She stated she felt coerced to allow a search and asked the officer if he was threatening her. RP said the officer said "it's a promise".

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Feb 11, 2016
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance
Disposition:

RP reported an EPD patrol vehicle rolling through 2 stop signs on Willakenzie.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Feb 11, 2016
Class/sub-class: Inquiry
Disposition: Dismissed-alt remedy

RP reported to the Auditor's office an incident in which he had stopped to watch officers conduct a DUII. After the officers finished he had a conversation with an officer. While talking with her another vehicle was pulled over and RP walked his bicycle across the street to observe that stop. RP watched that stop and when they finished up, they suddenly decided to cite him for not having a bike light. Four officers surrounded him, one snuck up behind him and grabbed the knife on his belt with no warning. RP understood this was an officer safety thing but he was not given any warning.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Feb 12, 2016
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance
Disposition:

RP contacted the Auditor's Office upset with the service he had received from EPD concerning his assault case. RP was assaulted by two men after leaving a party. RP has left school, and moved back home because of the incident and is still getting anonymous threatening calls because he involved the police. There is still little being done on his case.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Feb 12, 2016
Class/sub-class: Inquiry
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP filed a complaint that EPD will not follow through on a theft report her boyfriend made of his wallet being stolen. They have obtained video of the event and the name of the suspect.

Incident type: IA Investigation
Status: Active
Received date: Feb 16, 2016
Class/sub-class: Allegation of Misconduct / Performance
Disposition:

Allegation that an officer mishandled property (a motorcycle), failed to take it to ECU when directed to do so, and then contacted and without authorization used a civilian to attempt to recover the VIN number from the motorcycle.

1. POM 804: Evidence and Property Handling: that an officer failed to properly store the motorcycle when he kept it at 2nd and Lincoln despite being informed that policy required him to move it to ECU.
2. POM 804: Evidence and Property Handling: that an officer failed to properly handle the motorcycle when he asked a civilian, rather than FEU, to attempt to recover the VIN.

Incident type: IA Investigation
Status: Active
Received date: Feb 18, 2016
Class/sub-class: Allegation of Misconduct / Performance
Disposition:

1. 314 Vehicle Pursuits

It is alleged that an officer initiated and engaged in a pursuit of a suspect of a stolen vehicle that fled from a traffic stop in violation of the pursuit policy.

2. 314 Vehicle Pursuits

It is alleged that an officer engaged in a pursuit of a suspect of a stolen vehicle that fled from a traffic stop in violation of the pursuit policy.

Allegations:

Performance - 314 Vehicle Pursuit Policy

Incident type: IA Investigation
Status: Active
Received date: Feb 18, 2016
Class/sub-class: Allegation of Misconduct / Performance
Disposition:

Audit that had occurred regarding the submission of evidence/property that was not in compliance with current departmental policies and procedures.

The officer impounded these items from an anonymous citizen. The officer retained the items in a secured office with the intent of writing and executing a search warrant on the laptop and returning the merchandise. Sometime later, the officer submitted the items to ECU for return to owner/disposal.

1. POM 804: Evidence and Property Handling: That the officer failed to properly store these items after impounding them.

Incident type: IA Investigation
Status: Active
Received date: Feb 18, 2016
Class/sub-class: Allegation of Misconduct / Performance
Disposition:

An audit that had been completed regarding the submission of evidence/property not in compliance with current departmental policy and procedures. The items, from a possible allegation of a major felony, were provided by the victim to an officer. At the time, the victim was unsure if these had been the items worn and involved in the allegation. When the victim provided the items, the victim was unsure whether or not they wished to pursue a criminal investigation.

The officer held onto the items pending this decision and submitted them approximately 7 weeks later after documenting their recovery in a supplemental police report and noted the victim did not wish to pursue an investigation into the allegation. During the time these items were maintained in a secured office.

Incident type: Incident Review
Status: Active
Received date: Feb 18, 2016
Class/sub-class: Incident Review / Performance
Disposition:

After a trial and conviction, an officer was responsible for returning the items to ECU. It was determined that a pair of gloves was missing and the officer was counseled on the importance of confirming evidence checked out and assuring it is accounted for and submitted into ECU at the conclusion of an investigation and/or trial.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Feb 19, 2016
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance
Disposition:

RP contacted the Auditor's Officer inquiring into why a person who struck her vehicle after running a red light was not cited. RP was injured and transported to the hospital by her husband. RP does not understand how this person was not cited.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Feb 22, 2016
Class/sub-class: Inquiry
Disposition:

Officers were dispatched to a male-female dispute in Washington-Jefferson Park. An officer arrived and observed a male and female who appeared to be in an altercation, with the male grabbing at the female. The officer exited his vehicle and began walking towards them. The male began walking away and the officer told him to stop and was not free to leave. The male was argumentative and uncooperative, and refused to keep his hands out of his pockets. The officer grabbed the male and took him to the ground, where he handcuffed him. The male continued to be argumentative while on the ground. Three other officers were all standing around the male, and offered to help sit him up as he was laying on his stomach. The man refused and they let him remain. The man then began hitting his face on the pavement, causing injury (split lip) to his mouth. While the man was with officers he made allegations that he was stopped because of his race.

Inquiry at this point as the complainant alleged racial profiling.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Feb 22, 2016
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

The complainant called the 9-1-1 center admin line to advise that she had called in a dumpster fire early

that morning and had concerns. Her concerns were that the call-taker asked her several times the location and that the fire department did not respond. Records indicated that the fire department responded within 5 minutes.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Feb 24, 2016
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance
Disposition:

Issue with a Communications worker who dispatched Cahoots to a call about a man who threatened both suicide and homicide but the dispatcher only relayed the suicide information to Cahoots.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Feb 24, 2016
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance
Disposition:

An anonymous man reported a concern with an EPD officer who parked his vehicle (SUV) between the curb and a newly constructed pedestrian crosswalk on Barger Drive to speak with a pedestrian. RP sees officers do this type of thing frequently and is frustrated by it.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Feb 24, 2016
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance
Disposition:

RP stopped by the Auditor's Office to report that when he went to EPD headquarters to make a report about a woman who threatened and menaced him at the Big Y Cleaners on Hwy 99. RP claimed that he received poor service from an officer.

Incident type: Incident Review
Status: Active
Received date: Feb 25, 2016
Class/sub-class: Incident Review / Performance
Disposition:

RP emailed the Auditor's Office with concerns about a situation that happened at a school which resulted in a school lockout. RP lists various concerns about how EPD officers handled the situation. 1. It took police several hours to respond to the call about a violent man who had threatened to shoot/kill members of the school community. 2. When officers did arrive they were dismissive of the seriousness of the issue.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Feb 26, 2016
Class/sub-class: Inquiry
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP had concerns on how the department handled incidents where the RP had reported a drunk driver, vandalism that took place at a house that the RP owned, and also concern that EPD did not follow-up on a coin collection that was stolen from the RP. Most recently, the RP was given a parking citation from the City of Eugene (not EPD).

The incidents did not have a specific time frame, but maybe referencing incidents taking place

approximately 15 years prior.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Feb 26, 2016
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance
Disposition:

RP filed a complaint about how an officer handled his call for service about a trespass on his property.

Incident type: Auditor Intake
Status: Active
Received date: Feb 27, 2016
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Disputed Facts
Disposition:

RP emailed the Auditor's Office with the complaint that he was mistreated and harassed by an officer. RP was cited for Interfering with a police officer. RP did not initially give his name but complied once he was informed of his legal obligation to do so.

Incident type: Incident Review
Status: Active
Received date: Feb 29, 2016
Class/sub-class: Incident Review / Use of Force
Disposition:

Auditor initiated an Incident Review related to a use of force in which the arrested sustained an injury to her mouth during the course of her arrest.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Feb 29, 2016
Class/sub-class: Inquiry
Disposition:

RP called with a concern about her daughter being questioned by two officers at her school with accusations that she had child pornography on her phone.

The Eugene Police Department received 21 commendations from citizens in January, 2016. Below is a sample of those commendations.

A citizen submitted a commendation on an officer through social media for the assistance the officer provided recently with installing a car seat. The citizen commented, "(Officer's name) did a fantastic job assisting me with my child's car seat on my lunch break and even took a few minutes to talk about street crossing safety with my special education students and pose for a picture. I wanted to give him a shout out and big thank you!"

Officers were commended through social media for their assistance related to a Criminal Trespass incident. The citizen commented, "I would like to thank the officers; especially the two officers that quickly responded to do some patrols in my area after my call to you tonight. It's been a very busy night and the last thing I needed was to play hide and seek from a few people trying to get into our fence line...I super appreciate the extra patrols in the area tonight."

A citizen submitted a commendation for the actions and professionalism of an EPD officer. The officer responded to a call for service that involved suspicious conditions at a vacant home next door to the citizen. The officer was able to detain one of the trespassers at the location. The officer later called the citizen to inform them on the outcome of the situation. The citizen commented, "I just wanted to say thank you. It was making me very nervous." The citizen was very appreciative for the officer's assistance and follow-up of the situation.

A citizen and their spouse submitted a 'Thank You' card to the Eugene Police Department Staff that read as follows, "Thank you so very much for everything you do for our community."

An officer was commended by a citizen when they assisted the citizen in identifying a safety issue on their truck while traveling along I-5 near the Brownsville exit. The officer was on their way home from work when they identified the chain from the citizen's truck dragging on the road. They were able to assess the problem and the citizen stated that this "could have been a bad situation". They were very appreciative of the officer and commented, "He was very professional and very helpful."

A citizen submitted a letter to commend officers for their "professional and productive community oriented policing efforts" in the downtown area. The citizen commented, "I have observed countless times how the relationships they have built with the members of the community, of all socioeconomic backgrounds, led to investigations being solved more efficiently or even prevented a situation from boiling over in the first place...I have no doubt the downtown Eugene corridor is better today due to the efforts of these two law enforcement professionals."

An officer was commended by a citizen for the "high level of professionalism and concern" that was shown by the officer while assisting the citizen on a 'Criminal Mischief' incident that took place at his fellowship. The officer took the initial report and the citizen stated, "Over the course of the next sixteen plus hours, (officer's name) processed both crime scenes, located and processed the suspect vehicle and successfully interviewed the suspect." The citizen further commented, "(Officer's name) was scheduled to go off duty and had plans to travel to Bend, Oregon for his days off. Instead, (officer's name) pursued this investigation to its successful conclusion, disrupting his personal plans."

A citizen submitted a letter of commendation for the officers that responded to a fire that took the citizen's home. Once responders arrived, the citizen stated that they experienced "amazing kindness and concern". The citizen also commented, "I am and will be forever grateful to them all for what they did for me, and especially (detective's name), for their compassion, help, and patience with me in the time of the fire and days to follow."

A citizen commended a Records Specialist when they observed the Record Specialist's interaction at the front counter while dealing with a difficult citizen. The citizen felt that the employee handled the situation with "grace and professionalism".

An officer was commended by a citizen when they assisted the citizen in moving their disabled vehicle out of a busy intersection. The citizen commented, "I don't know what I would have done sitting there in the middle of traffic waiting for a tow truck to come and get me. Your timing could not have been better as it had just happened as you arrived. Sorry that you had to get such a workout by pushing the car, but again so thankful that you were there and took the time to stop, turn around and come back to help."