



## 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, July 12, 2016 - 5:30 p.m.**  
**Bascom Room, Eugene Public Library**  
**100 West 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue**  
**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. Public Comment	10 minutes (5:35 pm)
3. Minutes Approval (Minutes from April and June meetings)	10 minutes (5:45 pm)
4. Comments from Board Members, Human Rights Commission Liaison and Police Commission Liaison	10 minutes (5:55 pm)
5. Training Topic: Public Records and Public Meetings	20 minutes (6:55 pm)
6. Break	10 minutes (6:45 pm)
7. Case Review: Selection of Service Complaints, Policy Complaints, and Inquiries.	40 minutes (6:05 pm)
8. Auditor Report	15 minutes (7:15 pm)
9. Adjourn	(7:30 pm)

NAME OF MEETING: Civilian Review Board  
DATE OF MEETING: April 12, 2016  
TO: Vicki Cox  
RECORDED BY: Linda Henry

---

---

**ROUTING INFORMATION**

**MINUTES**

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

April 12, 2016  
5:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Bernadette Conover, Chair; Eric Van Houten, Vice Chair; Maurice Denner, Heather Marek (left at 6:20 p.m.), Steven McIntire, Chris Wig (left at 6:20 p.m.), Civilian Review Board members; Vicki Cox, Mark Gissiner, Leia Pitcher Police Auditor's Office; Lt. Carolyn Mason, Sgt. Ryan Nelson, Sgt. Sgt. Kyle Williams, Eugene Police Department.

ABSENT: Lindsey Foltz, Civilian Review Board member.

Chair Conover convened the Civilian Review Board (CRB) at 5:30 p.m.

**I. AGENDA AND MATERIALS REVIEW**

Noting no objections, Ms. Conover deemed the agenda approved.

**II. PUBLIC COMMENT**

Ms. Conover called for public comment.

Majeska Seese-Green stated she was recording tonight's CRB meeting.

**III. MINUTES APPROVAL—February 9 and March 8, 2016**

**February 9, 2016**

Mr. McIntire said he had reviewed the CRB's bylaws and policies. Use of the word "may" in Section 4 of the bylaws was clear, meaning "option." Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) 192.650 made it clear that minutes could be recorded or written, and Ms. Marek's assertion that the CRB bylaws and policies required both written and recorded minutes was not correct. Section 2 of the policy stated meetings must be recorded, which meant there must be minutes. Written minutes were legally acceptable, and the policy did not require both recorded and written minutes. He would support a clarification to Section 2 if the CRB felt the section was ambiguous. He asserted

the minutes must be a reflection of what was said and he did not believe the proposed changes would enhance anything. The changes were an argument and added no real substance. If someone had an issue about what he or she said, he or she should raise the issue. He did not think people should speak for others. He did not want to make the meetings about editing minutes from previous meetings to provide the level of detail that would be available if the meetings were audio recorded. The motion did not pass and he opined such efforts were an attempt to end run that motion. The CRB needed to move on. He did not support adopting any of Ms. Marek's proposed changes.

Ms. Marek iterated her concerns that the summary minutes did not accurately reflect comments she or other CRB members made during the meeting. Failure to include her corrections to the minutes deprived the public of an accurate account of what was said, which led to a lack of transparency by the CRB. She felt she had a duty to make sure the minutes were accurate. The minutes as recorded presented a different meaning to CRB members' comments than was intended. She asserted that other CRB members misinterpreted her intent, and that no one on the CRB had addressed the substance of her amendments and concerns for transparency. She was frustrated that this discussion was not important to other CRB members who represented the community. The public should know there was a dispute among CRB members and that the minutes were not accurate. Her intent was not to reopen the audio recording conversation. She wanted CRB members to work well together which required some disagreements and bringing politics into the conversations. She valued the diverse perspectives of other CRB members.

Ms. Conover called for a motion to approve the February 9, 2016 minutes as written.

Ms. Marek asked for approval to tell the Minutes Recorder about each of her corrections.

Ms. Pitcher stated that Mr. Gissiner had concerns with ethical issues related to accepting transcriptions that had been paid for by individuals or agencies other than those contracted for by the City of Eugene.

Ms. Marek said she had paid for the transcription herself.

Ms. Conover concurred with Ms. Pitcher's concerns with accepting a transcript prepared by a company that had not been contracted with by the City of Eugene or the CRB. She noted only a part of the meeting rather than the entire meeting had been transcribed, and the case discussion was a higher priority topic. She was not in favor of any of the amendments proposed by Ms. Marek, noting Ms. Marek's comments did not enhance the minutes. In the past, people who were not members of the CRB, including police officers, had not been allowed to provide changes to the minutes.

Mr. McIntire said the CRB had discussed this issue for three months. A motion had been made at a previous meeting to approve Ms. Marek's corrections but it had not carried.

Mr. McIntire moved to approve the February 9, 2016 minutes as presented.

Ms. Conover noted she generally approved CRB minutes by acclamation but that was not appropriate for this situation.

Ms. Pitcher noted corrections to the February 9, 2016 minutes, other than those proposed by Ms. Marek, had been offered at the March 8, 2016 meeting.

The motion failed for lack of a second.

In response to Ms. Conover, Ms. Marek said she had not made 22 changes to the February 6, 2016 minutes. The numbers related to her changes identified paragraphs.

Mr. Wig said it was not appropriate to make amendments to minutes by acclamation.

Mr. Denner, seconded by Ms. Marek, moved to approve the February 9, 2016 minutes, with the addition of items 1-22 Ms. Marek introduced at the March 8, 2016 meeting.

CRB members discussed whether or not to include Ms. Marek's items 1-22 in the February minutes.

Ms. Marek repeatedly iterated her concerns that the summary minutes did not accurately reflect comments she or other CRB members made during the meeting.

Ms. Conover asked Ms. Marek to remain professional in her criticism of others. She stated that she would not accept the minutes with the proposed corrections.

Mr. McIntire read section 4 of the bylaws and noted that Ms. Marek's correction #8 did not occur based on the bylaws.

Mr. Van Houten said he had listened to the audio and reviewed the notes Ms. Marek had provided. He agreed that the audio offered details of the meeting not included in the minutes but it did not change the tenor of the meeting. He would vote to approve Ms. Marek's corrections to the February 9, 2016 minutes, but it opened a door the CRB had already voted on. He would not support the issue in the future. He felt the action was beating a dead horse and contributed to the CRB's lack of functioning well.

Mr. Denner, seconded by Mr. McIntire, moved to approve the February 9, 2016 minutes as amended at the March 8, 2016 meeting.

Ms. Marek said she should be able to change her own comments that appeared in the minutes.

The motion passed 4:2, with CRB members Conover, Denner, McIntire, and Wig voting in favor of the motion, and CRB members Marek and Van Houten voting against the motion.

### **March 8, 2016**

Ms. Conover offered the following corrections to the March 8, 2016 minutes:

Page 3, paragraph 6, sentence 4 should read: It was best when the CRB acted as a tool **for the education of the** community and EPD.

Page 4, paragraph 6, sentence 1 should read: Ms. Conover thanked Asst. Chief Durr for providing information to the CRB on the Blue Team **and his service to the community**.

Page 6, paragraph 2, sentence 3 should read: In response to Ms. Conover, Sgt. Nelson said court was not in session when ~~before~~ the incident occurred.

Page 6, section 3f, should read: Sgt. Nelson added EPD policies used must/shall whenever possible.

Ms. Conover called for approval of the March 8, 2016 minutes as amended. The motion passed 4:2, with CRB members Conover, Denner, McIntire, and Wig voting in favor of the motion, and CRB members Marek and Van Houten voting against the motion.

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

Mr. Wig noted this may be his last meeting as a member of the CRB. He appreciated the opportunity to serve on the CRB and expressed his appreciation for the education he had received through serving on the CRB.

Ms. Marek wished Mr. Wig success in his future endeavors. She had an ongoing concern related to getting descriptions of closed cases, noting the descriptions provided were brief. She did not have any comments related to the Human Rights Commission (HRC).

Bonnie Souza, liaison to the CRB from the HRC, said she was co-chairing an anti-discrimination work shop. The HRC would host anti-discrimination focus groups through June 2016. The HRC would prepare a report for the City Council that would include comments from the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) community.

Mr. Van Houten said transparency was important for the CRB and he did not want to politicize the issue. He had always placed a high level of trust in the work of Mr. Gissiner, Ms. Pitcher and the CRB. He was interested in the comments the HRC received from LGBT community.

Mr. McIntire echoed Mr. Van Houten's comments regarding the importance of transparency for the CRB and the importance of finding a path to move forward. During his tenure on the CRB, he had observed the Eugene Police Department (EPD) command staff continue to improve transparency with Internal Affairs (IA) investigations. He attended the recent Police Commission meeting. He was working with Ms. Pitcher to address policy concerns.

Mr. Denner said he hoped the focus groups noted by Ms. Souza would provide disgruntled people an avenue to address their issues with City of Eugene boards and commissions. He was impressed with the number of cases the Police Auditor's office had opened during the last month. Ms. Pitcher and Mr. Gissiner did a good job of identifying cases for the CRB to review. He noted there were several similar cases related to evidence procedures and suggested it might be worth reviewing a case in the future.

Ms. Conover concurred with Mr. Van Houten and Mr. McIntire's comments regarding to transparency. She was aware of one case heard in Judge Mooney's court in Lane County where the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) had raised transparency concerns. Under the current

legislation, there were better ways to address issues related to labor unions than through the court system. She noted she would be resigning from the CRB in the near future.

## **VI. BREAK**

The CRB took a short break.

Ms. Marek and Mr. Wig left at 6:20 p.m.

## **V. TRAINING TOPIC: RECRUIT HIRING**

Sgt. Kyle Williams said he had been with the EPD for 11 years and served as the sergeant for the recruiting team. He offered a PowerPoint presentation entitled *Recruitment Team Overview*, and facilitated a discussion on the following topics:

- Recruiting Team Members
- Recruiting Team Assignments
- Updated Recruitment Materials
- Team Equipment
- Training
- Accomplishments to Date
- Current Projects

## **VII. CASE REVIEW: ALLEGATION THAT AN EPD EMPLOYEE ENGAGED IN A VEHICLE PURSUIT IN VIOLATION OF POLICY AND DID NOT FOLLOW AN ORDER TO TERMINATE THE PURSUIT.**

Ms. Pitcher offered a PowerPoint presentation entitled *Case Summary—Civilian Review Board—April 12, 2016* and facilitated a discussion on the case before the CRB.

### Summary of Facts

- Officer A located a stolen vehicle and notified dispatch. The vehicle then made an illegal left turn across traffic.
- Officer A followed the vehicle and narrowly avoided colliding with a truck; Officer A allowed two vehicles to clear the intersection and then activated his emergency lights and sirens.
- Officer A pursued the vehicle and notified dispatch he was in pursuit. Sergeant B ordered him to terminate the pursuit.
- Officer A turned off his emergency equipment and slowed down, but he continued to follow the vehicle and disobeyed a stop sign.
- Officer A stated in his interview that it was not his intention to become involved in a pursuit with the vehicle and that he experienced tunnel vision during the incident.
- Officer A also stated in his interview that he believed he had terminated the pursuit when he turned off his emergency equipment and slowed down. He stated that he did not recall disobeying the stop sign and that he believed he had followed Sergeant B's order.

### Allegations

1. **Vehicle Pursuit Policy**—That Officer A violated the pursuit policy because:

a) The reason for the stop did not meet the threshold for initiating a pursuit; and, b) Officer A did not drive with due regard for the safety of others when following the vehicle through an intersection.

2. **Insubordination**—That Officer A was insubordinate when he failed to terminate the pursuit after receiving a direct order from a police sergeant.

#### Recommended Adjudication

1. Vehicle Pursuit Policy
  - EPD chain of command: Sustained •Auditor’s Office: Sustained (concur with EPD chain of command)
  - Chief’s Adjudication: Sustained
2. Insubordination
  - EPD chain of command: Unfounded
  - Auditor’s Office: Unfounded (concur with EPD chain of command)
  - Chief’s Adjudication: Unfounded

#### Issues for CRB Discussion

Ms. Conover said she would share Mr. Wig’s comments on the case which he gave to her prior to leaving tonight’s meeting.

- Complaint Intake and Classification
  - Mr. Wig appreciated the completeness of the investigation.
- Internally reported following pursuit review
- Classification: Allegation of Misconduct
- Complaint Investigation and Monitoring
  - Mr. Wig said Sgt. Nelson did an excellent job on this investigation.
  - Mr. Denner was impressed that Sgt. D took the time and asked the right questions.
  - Sgt. Nelson said there was one allegation of violating the pursuit policy, but that allegation covered several instances where the employee’s actions did not comport with the policy.
  - Mr. Van Houten appreciated Sgt. B’s response to the involved officer. The prepared statement was well done.
- Relevant Department Policies and Practices
  - 314 Vehicle Pursuit Policy
  - 1101.1.B.15 Insubordination
    - In response to Mr. McIntire, Sgt. Nelson said it was important to make sure the investigation was accurate.
    - Ms. Conover said staff in IA had been helpful in supporting CRB members in a learning process with understanding the investigation process.
    - In response to Mr. Van Houten, Sgt. Nelson said the pursuit policy has been tightening up across the country. EPD was currently focusing on saturating an area with officers rather than having individual officers pursue subjects, in more of a perimeter rather than pursuit practice.
    - In response to Ms. Conover, Sgt. Nelson stated that EPD officers received extensive training when the when the policy was introduced. Training consisted of table top exercises as well as driving exercises.
    - Sgt. Nelson said EPD had other investigations on pursuits, but the important piece with this case was insubordination.
    - Mr. McIntire stated this was a dangerous situation and it was important to strike the right balance.

- Sgt. Nelson said he had seen pursuit situations which resulted in bad outcomes, with people being injured or killed.
  - Mr. Gissiner said approximately 300 people were killed in high speed chases annually, with 42 percent of those people being innocent of any infractions. It is becoming standard practice to limit pursuits to violent felons.
  - Sgt. Nelson noted that Oregon State Police, the Lane County Sheriff's Office and the Springfield Police Department continued to engage in pursuits.
- Policy and/or Training Considerations
  - Mr. Wig said this current policy was improved over the 2014 edition.
- Adjudication Recommendations
  - Ms. Conover observed no one disagreed with the adjudication recommendations.
- Additional Comments/Concerns
  - Mr. Denner noted the lag in time between when the complaint was first filed and when the final adjudication occurred, when this should have been a simple issue to resolve.
  - Mr. Wig noted this case was a strong contrast with the case the CRB reviewed in March 2016 related to honesty concerns.
  - Mr. Van Houten noted the evidence was supported by the in-car video (ICV)

## **VIII. AUDITOR REPORT**

Mr. Gissiner reported he had met with Chief Kerns about the IA process and concerns expressed by the rank and file officers in EPD. He was seeing a shift towards an ombudsman model from the Blue Team/Sergeant being held accountable for the IA investigations. Major cases were currently being entered into the system within 12 to 24 hours of an event occurring, most cases having been addressed by the Blue Team. Most EPD contacts were currently occurring with mental health or other long term situations. The classification specifications for a new, part time, bilingual staff person in the Police Auditor's office had been completed and would be posted soon. He had been talking with Dr. Gerardo Sandoval in the Department of Planning, Public Policy & Management at the University of Oregon about a project on community outreach and policy issues. Ms. Pitcher was attending local Integration Network meetings and examining whether local policy was going in the right direction.

## **IX. ADJOURN**

Ms. Conover said the next CRB meeting was scheduled for May 10, 2016.

The meeting adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

*(Recorded by Linda Henry)*



NAME OF MEETING: Civilian Review Board  
DATE OF MEETING: June 14, 2016  
TO: Vicki Cox  
RECORDED BY: Linda Henry

---

**ROUTING INFORMATION**

## MINUTES

Civilian Review Board  
Sloat Room—Atrium Building—99 West Tenth Avenue  
Eugene, Oregon

June 14, 2016  
5:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Eric Von Houten, Chair; Lindsey Foltz, Vice Chair; Maurice Denner, Steven McIntire, Chris Wig, Civilian Review Board members; Vicki Cox, Mark Gissiner, Leia Pitcher Police Auditor's Office; Sgt. Larry Crompton, Eugene Police Department.

ABSENT: Heather Marek Civilian Review Board member.

Chair Van Houten convened the Civilian Review Board (CRB) at 5:30 p.m.

### **I. AGENDA AND MATERIALS REVIEW**

There were no changes to the agenda.

### **II. PUBLIC COMMENT**

Mr. Van Houten noted Majeska Seese-Green would be recording tonight's CRB meeting.

### **III. MINUTES APPROVAL—April 12 and May 10, 2016**

#### **April 12, 2016**

Approval of the April 12, 2106 minutes was deferred to a future meeting.

#### **May 10, 2016**

Mr. Wig, seconded by Mr. Denner, moved for approval of the May 10, 2016 minutes as submitted. The motion passed unanimously, 5:0.

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

Mr. McIntire said the last Police Commission meeting was a joint meeting with the Human Rights Commission. They had a presentation on the Spokane Community Court which Eugene was hoping to model their Community Court which is scheduled to open in September 2016. The court was currently funded for three years, and the community would seek funding beyond that point. The intent of the program was reduce the number of people who continually circled through the system, with ongoing mental health, Department of Licensing (DOL) and other issues. The car camping ordinance was up for renewal and the City of Eugene was working with St. Vincent de Paul. He expressed disappointment that the Police Commission was using court reporters at their meetings. He thought the cost of that service could be used for other things.

Mr. Denner expressed regret over the recent events in Orlando, Florida. It showed we have a distance to go. He noted there were two months of open and closed cases in the agenda packet. He was concerned about the calls for service. The public did not understand the process when charges were filed. He asked if it would be possible for the Eugene Police Department (EPD) Public Information Officer (PIO) to get information to the media to help better inform the public.

Mr. Wig shared Mr. McIntire's excitement with the Spokane Community Court model. He had worked in Drug Court, which was an alternative court intended to involve people in positive social activities and reduce repeated contacts. The tragic events in Orlando were in everyone's hearts and thoughts. He noted domestic violence was a precipitating event for many other behaviors and touched many families. It was important to find a way to combat male rage and feelings of entitlement.

Mr. Van Houten welcomed Mr. Wig and Mr. McIntire for another term on the CRB. In light of the Orlando events, it was important to honor other people's opinions and beliefs. He was concerned that we as a culture were losing the ability for healthy discord.

#### **V. CASE REVIEW: RELATED TO AN EMPLOYEE'S HANDLING OF EVIDENCE (A SUSPECTED STOLEN MOTORCYCLE)**

Ms. Pitcher offered a PowerPoint presentation entitled *Case Summary—Civilian Review Board—June 14, 2016* and facilitated a discussion on the case before the CRB.

##### Summary of Facts

- Officer E stopped a motorcycle for a taillight violation. The driver did not have insurance or registration paperwork, Records were unable to locate a record for the license number, and Officer E was unable to find a VIN on the vehicle.
- Officer A responded to the stop to assist Officer E. Officers seized the motorcycle for a VIN inspection and had it towed to the City Shops. Officer A secured it in a locked area out of the elements.
- Approximately two days later, Officer A was advised by a supervisor in the Forensics Unit as well as Sergeant B that the policy had changed, and that the motorcycle should have been towed to the Evidence Control Unit (ECU).
- Officer A was concerned about incurring tow charges, so he attempted to contact another supervisor to get approval for the second tow. They spoke approximately two days later, and that supervisor also advised Officer A to have the motorcycle towed.
- Officer A stated that he intended to have the motorcycle towed to the proper facility when he returned to work following the weekend. Officer A stated that he was dispatched to a call immediately after briefing and unable to get the motorcycle towed during business hours.
- The following day – 10 days after the motorcycle was seized – the owner of the motorcycle called regarding its status. Sergeant B discovered at that time that the motorcycle had not yet been brought to ECU.
- Also on that day, Officer A contacted retired EPD Sergeant G, who responded to the City Shops to assist Officer A. G volunteered to attempt to restore the VIN by applying a mild chemical agent. G was unsuccessful in recovering the VIN.

- Officer A then contacted Forensic Evidence Specialist H who processed the motorcycle at the City Shops, recovering a partial VIN.
- Officer A then had the motorcycle towed to ECU and made arrangements to have it stored inside, out of the elements.
- Sergeant B entered this matter into Blue team for classification and follow up.

#### Allegations

1. **Vehicle Tows and Inventories** – that Officer A failed to secure the vehicle (motorcycle) at ECU, in violation of policy, instead storing it at the City Shops.
2. **Evidence and Property Handling** – that Officer A failed to properly process evidence (a motorcycle) when he asked a retired EPD employee, not under contract with the City or registered as a volunteer, rather than FEU, to attempt to recover the VIN.

#### Recommended Adjudication

1. **Vehicle Tows and Inventories**
  - EPD chain of command: Unfounded
  - Auditor’s Office: Sustained
  - Chief’s Adjudication: Sustained
2. **Evidence and Property Handling**
  - EPD chain of command: Unfounded
  - Auditor’s Office: Sustained
  - Chief’s Adjudication:
    - Originally Dismissed
    - Amended adjudication: Unfounded

#### Issues for CRB Discussion

- Complaint Intake and Classification
  - Internally reported following inquiry from motorcycle owner as to its status and location
  - Classification: Allegation of Misconduct
    - Mr. Denner had no problem with the original complaint against Officer A. He did have questions about Officer B. He asked if Officer E should also be responsible for the motorcycle when it was towed to the wrong location.
    - Sgt. Crompton said Officer A became the primary officer. The evidence policy was fairly new. Officer A was familiar with the old police and had not impounded vehicles under the new policy.
    - Mr. Denner said the policy requires that a Supervisor approve a vehicle impound. He asked if the Supervisor had been contacted and if the impound had been approved.
    - Sgt. Crompton said in the past, a Supervisor had to approve an impound, but that changed with the new policy.
    - In response to Mr. Van Houten, Mr. Gissiner said a Blueteam report had not been made until the citizen complained. Mr. Van Houten said it was important for clear communication and appreciated the nuance of the phrase “authorize”.
    - Sgt. Crompton said the new policy, as written, was subjective. Use of the term “authorize” was intended to prevent errors. He opined the way the policy was written should be reviewed in the future.

- Complaint Investigation and Monitoring
  - Mr. Denner said during Officer A's interview with the Sergeant, there was an indication that a supplemental report would follow. He asked if that happened. Sgt. Crompton confirmed the supplemental report was prepared.
  - Mr. Denner asked if any additional charges were filed against the operator of the motorcycle as a result of the supplemental report.
  - Sgt. Crompton said when it was confirmed that the motorcycle was stolen, several felony charges were filed. The driver of the motorcycle was looking at a 13 month sentence for stolen parts and motorcycle frame.
  - In response to Mr. Denner, Sgt. Crompton said a search warrant was not written. Under Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS), a search warrant was not needed in this case. He added that getting search warrant could be time consuming, taking 4 to 8 hours. Based on ORS, the search warrant was not needed based on a motor vehicle exception and seizure was allowed when the vehicle identification number (VIN) was obliterated.
  - Mr. Wig said the report was very thorough.
  - Mr. Van Houten was concerned that the motorcycle was stored in a facility that was not secure. He noted Officer A did not like the Lincoln Street site for motorcycle storage and asked why the new location was not preferred by the officers. He thought the officer was being upfront with his concern that the new location was a bad place.
  - Sgt. Crompton said because of a pending lawsuit, the officer was cautious and wanted to ensure the motorcycle was not stored where it would be subject to the outdoor elements. EPD needed to have a clear and direct location where property could be stored.
- Relevant Department Policies and Practices
  - 510 Vehicle Tows and Inventories
  - 804 Evidence and Property Handling
    - Mr. McIntire said Policy 804 called for care being taken to ensure the change of custody was followed. It appeared different officers had different opinions about the security of the site.
    - Sgt. Crompton said the policy had changed a lot over time. The retired officer who Officer A contacted and asked to help him had been a mentor to Officer A and Officer A had sought his advice in the past.
    - Mr. McIntire said the ambiguous language in the policy should be more clear. He noted part of the delay of moving the motorcycle to the correct evidence storage area was delayed because Officer A was concerned about an extra towage fee after hours.
    - Sgt. Crompton said due to the pending law suit, Officer A wanted have total responsibility rather than turning moving the motorcycle over to another officer. He wanted to get permission before incurring extra towing costs.
    - Mr. McIntire said the report indicated that a retired sergeant had better a data base due to his work in the insurance industry that EPD had.
    - Sgt. Crompton said he had not looked into that because it was not relevant to the investigation. He noted the retired officer did have access to a large database through his contacts.
    - Mr. McIntire noted the retired EPD office had helped Officer A in the past. He asked why Officer A had not started with the EPD forensics unit.

- Sgt. Crompton said Officer A had a long term professional relationship with the retired officer and trusted his expertise. The retired officer was not able to recover the partial VIN because, although he used the correct chemical, he did not have access to a strong version of it. The forensics unit did have access to the stronger chemical and was able to recover a partial VIN.
  - Mr. Wig said Officer A said using the retired officer would provide insulation from liability.
  - Mr. Gissiner said the retired officer was not working as an EPD volunteer or contractor, and there could have been liability issues if the retired officer had been injured. The retire officer could serve as a contractor with a \$1/year contract or as a volunteer. Bringing in someone to manage evidence, regardless of his level of expertise, was a poor decision. A defendant expects purity in the handling of evidence.
  - Mr. Wig agreed with Mr. Gissiner. He asked if the retired officer thought using him would provide insulation due to his expert witness status.
  - Sgt. Crompton said the retired officer volunteered for many agencies who did not have internal experts due to his expert status. However, EPD had internal experts. Officer A was comfortable with the retired officer because he was certified by the courts as an expert witness. He did not expect any favors in exchange of his volunteer work. He did the work because he loved to do it.
  - In response to Ms. Pitcher, Sgt. Crompton said the forensics evidence unit would have been authorized to complete the process for recovering the VIN in the field, whereas the retired officer did it in the evidence storage area.
  - Mr. Van Houten said there appeared to be a lack of communication because Officer A had not communicated to the supervisor about what was happening.
- Policy and/or Training Considerations
  - Mr. Denner said EPD needed to ensure that street level employees received training on the new policy and to establish a clear training record for street level employees.
  - Ms. Foltz said the policy should be clear that people who did not have an affiliation with EPD did not have access to evidence without supervision of an EPD employee. She did not agree with the Police Auditor that the second allegation was not founded.
  - Mr. Van Houten said mistakes were caused by lack of communication by the officers. There was a lot of gray area in policing due to human nature. It was important for EPD to avoid those gray areas.
  - Mr. McIntire said Policy 804.4 was too ambiguous, asserting if five people read the policy, there would be five different interpretations. Officers needed to receive adequate training on the policy. There should be a policy related to using external people. Use of the retired officer invited unnecessary scrutiny.
- Adjudication Recommendations
  - Amended final adjudication
    - Mr. Wig agreed with Chief Kern’s adjudication. He agreed with Mr. Gissiner’s adjudication but the policy did not cover what happened. The policy needed to be fixed. To hold Officer A responsible for violating the policy when it was a common practice in EPD was arbitrary.
    - Mr. Gissiner said Policing 101 called for integrity in storing property. The action was cultural rather than a policy issue. Precision in evidence gathering was a

fundamental principal of policy and the criminal justice system. Ms. Foltz agreed with the Police Auditor's interpretation of the policy that the officer did not adequately protect the property when a casual civilian bystander was allowed to handle evidence. The complaint should be sustained.

- Mr. Van Houten agreed that the policy was open to interpretation. He disagreed with Chief Kerns' interpretation. The CRB had seen many property custody issues. He asked if EPD would have felt differently if a person who was not a former EPD employee had handled the evidence.
  - Sgt. Crompton said the retired officer had been helping officers for years, which was part of the decision to call upon him to assist with this case.
  - Mr. Van Houten said the adjudication should be based on policy rather than from a personal perspective. EPD needed to reduce the risk to the officer and use a first line of quality defense.
  - Mr. McIntire said both allegations should have been sustained.
  - Mr. Denner concurred with Mr. Wig, but he did not completely disagree with Mr. Gissiner's adjudication.
- Additional Comments/Concerns
  - Mr. Denner said there was a fine line between the officer initiated investigation and a formal investigation. The senior officer should have made the decision to tow the motorcycle to the appropriate evidence storage facility. Both officers were detailed to an event in northwest Eugene which distracted them from following through with the tow. EPD needed a policy with clear guidelines.
  - Ms. Foltz said the retired officer operated in a community of trust, but as a community member, she did not have that trust in the retired officer. Officer A violated policy when he had the motorcycle towed to the wrong facility and it took a long time to rectify the error. The reasons for the delay were flimsy.
  -

## **VI. BREAK**

The CRB took a short break.

Mr. Van Houten left at 7:05 p.m.

## **VII. DISCUSSION ITEM: BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS STIPEND**

Vice Chair Foltz chaired the meeting.

Ms. Foltz asked the CRB to consider asking the City Council to create a stipend for people who had barriers to serving on boards and commissions. It would not need to be a large amount. She had noticed that the same people served continuously year after year. She asked for feedback from CRB members.

Ms. Pitcher stated there were 4 CRB members remaining at the meeting, which constituted a quorum. She noted the topic had been identified as a Discussion Item on the agenda, but the CRB could take action if it chose to do so. She supported Ms. Foltz's proposal.

Mr. McIntire noted the CRB struggled with diversity with its membership. He would support Ms. Foltz's proposal if it would help eliminate barriers to people serving on the CRB.

Mr. Denner thought a stipend may be a good idea for some people. He noted people received a small compensation when they served on jury duty. He noted in the past, the proposal for compensation for the Eugene City Council and Mayor had been supported by the public. He thought the stipend would be an incentive for some people and he would encourage flexibility. He suggested the Police Auditor could compensate those who needed compensation and who asked for it. He thought not everyone would ask for the compensation.

Ms. Pitcher said she had served on a board that under federal law, 51 percent of the board members were required to be consumers. A stipend for child car and transportation had helped diversity the board.

Mr. Gissiner thought it was a good idea and proposed moving the proposal forward. He opined approximately 100 people served on various City of Eugene boards and commissions.

Ms. Foltz suggested a pool could be established, with an assessment per seat for all boards and commissions. People would be allocated a stipend based on an application basis. She suggested moving the idea forward to another board, such as the Human Rights Commission (HRC), and then moving the proposal forward jointly to the City Council.

Mr. Denner suggested another group would be the Police Commission (PC) as a way to help build a structure for the proposal.

Ms. Pitcher said she could approach the HRC and PC staff with the idea.

Ms. Foltz said it would take time for the idea to move forward and suggested it could be implemented with the next boards and commissions recruitment cycle.

Mr. McIntire said his employer encouraged employees to volunteer in the community and offered flexibility scheduling to support that. He asserted the City Council should make this happen.

Mr. Wig thought this was a good idea. He thought there may be time to look at the supplemental budget for funding the program.

In response to Ms. Foltz, Mr. Gissiner said the CRB Annual Report would be sent to the City Council in July 2016.

Mr. McIntire, seconded by Mr. Wig, moved that the Police Auditor forward a request to the City Council for providing a stipend for board and commission members as a way to encourage diversity on the CRB. The motion passed unanimously, 5:0.

Ms. Foltz and Ms. Pitcher agreed to meet to draft the proposal for submittal to the City Council.

Ms. Foltz noted it was 7:30 pm. She noted consensus to extend the meeting.

## **VIII. AUDITOR REPORT**

Mr. Gissiner reported the Budget Committee had considered audio recordings and court stenographers for all City Council meetings and all board and commission meetings. When an estimate of \$200,000 to



\$250,000 annual was received, the City Council approved having a stenographer transcribe City Council and CRB meetings, accompanied by audio recordings. This was approved for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2016 by the budget committee but not formally approved by Council. He added a court stenographer could be at the July 2016 CRB meeting. The funding for this service was in the City Council/City Manager's budget as recommended by the budget committee.

Mr. Gissiner said four people were being interviewed for the part time Community Engagement Coordinator. There was funding in the budget for a limited duration position for one year. He noted most civilian oversight agencies in the U.S. had Community Engagement Officers.

Mr. Gissiner stated the complaint filed by the NAACP involving a use of force was near completion.

**IX. ADJOURN**

The meeting adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

*(Recorded by Linda Henry)*

Eugene Police Department  
June 2016 Closed Case Report

Incident type: IA Investigation  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Jan 22, 2016  
Class/sub-class: Allegation of Misconduct / Performance  
Disposition: Sustained

A call was received that was initially entered as a Trespass call for service. The complainant later called back and provided additional information which indicated the need for medical assistance.

1. 1101.1.B.9 Unsatisfactory Performance

It is alleged that a communications employee by failing to take appropriate action when no attempt was made to obtain further information on the subject's condition, failed to attempt to have the caller render aid to the subject, entered incorrect details to the call notes, and failed to send the call to fire dispatch per established protocols.

1101.1.B.9 Unsatisfactory Performance - Sustained

2. 1101.1.B.9 Unsatisfactory Performance

It is alleged that a communications employee failed to take appropriate action by failing to send the call to fire dispatch and failed to follow procedures based upon the information available per established protocols.

1101.1.B.9 Unsatisfactory Performance - Sustained

## Eugene Police Department

June 2016 Open Case Report

---

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

Both officers identified a suspect based on a radio broadcast description. They gave chase and told him he was under arrest. The man tried to scale a chain link fence with barbed wire on top but was unable to before an officer caught him and pulled him off. The man struck his face on the ground and sustained some small, superficial abrasions to his left cheek and forehead. The second officer arrived and pulled out his Taser. He told the man that if he fought he would be tasered. The man did not offer any more resistance and was taken into custody. The man told a supervisor was injured and that he felt it was because of his race. Photographs were taken of the small abrasions. The man told the supervisor he did run from the Police and was trying to climb a fence when he was pulled off. He indicated that was how his face was injured.

He was reported to Officers as a suspect and ICV and Officers' statements indicated a lawful, appropriate stop and arrest.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Jun 2, 2016  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Service level  
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

The reporting party (RP) submitted a letter stating that within the last nine months, four letters have been sent to EPD in regards to filing a report about his stolen vehicle, to which he has not received any response. The RP would really like for an officer to stop by the jail (LCAC) so that he may file a report.

Note: A lieutenant requested an officer be dispatched to the jail to contact RP. An officer contacted the RP and is conducting the follow up he requested.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Jun 3, 2016  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance  
Disposition: Dismissed-alt remedy

RP wrote the Auditor's Office and complained that 2 officers woke her from sleep and arrested her related to a matter that another officer had previously resolved. She complained that the arrest was without merit.

Dismissed by Auditor as Alternate Remedy, for courts to determine.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: Jun 3, 2016  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Service level  
Disposition:

The RP is dissatisfied with the lack of progress on a theft investigation.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: Jun 3, 2016  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Courtesy  
Disposition:

RP called the Auditor's Office to complain that when he and friends waved to an EPD vehicle, the driver flipped them off.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: Jun 3, 2016  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance  
Disposition:

RP called the Auditor's Office to complain about how an officer handled the theft of her lawnmower. The officer allegedly determined that it was a civil issue and no charges were filed.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Jun 6, 2016  
Class/sub-class: Policy Complaint  
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP reported an incident in which two officers came to his home with a third party about a bicycle he was selling on Craig's List. When RP bought the bike two months ago he verified the serial number with EPD before the purchase. The third party claimed the bike was theirs by only identifying the handle bars. (They did not have a serial number and noted that the rest the bike was different) The officers took the bike from him and gave it to this third party on this small amount of identification. RP feels the officers stole his bike from him. RP was also cited for meth in a trailer on his property that was not his meth.

---

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

RP contacted an officer and requested a supervisor contact him in the west park blocks. He stated that he was sleeping in the park when he was woken up by an officer. He stated the officer was disrespectful and condescending. He stated that he felt their contact could have gone better if the officer showed him a little more respect. The man could not give any exact quotes.

---

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

RP filed a complaint with the Auditor about the rudeness by officers who accompanied code enforcement inspectors to her residence on 2 separate days. RP stated that comments and jokes were made about the residence as well as the owner and occupants. When RP asked officers for their business cards she was told they did not have them, after asking again she was verbally given the names.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Jun 8, 2016

Class/sub-class: Inquiry  
Disposition: Dismissed-Other

RP reported that he has left messages with a Lt. numerous times, and had not gotten a return call. The last time he left a message was a couple of weeks ago. RP was just checking in on how the Lt. was doing.

Per Auditor - Dismissed - Other.

---

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

RP reported a concern about how an accident was investigated.

---

Incident type: IA Investigation  
Status: Active  
Received date: Jun 8, 2016  
Class/sub-class: Allegation of Misconduct / Conduct  
Disposition:

It is alleged that while at a work related conference, an officer became intoxicated in a public place in the presence of subordinate employees and members of other law enforcement agencies, and spoke to someone who allegedly did not find the comments appropriate.

Allegations:

Conduct - 1101.1.B.25 Unbecoming Conduct  
Performance - 1101.1.B.17 Judgment  
Conduct - 1101.1.B.27 Use of Intoxicants and Medications

---

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

RP reported that when her vehicle was stolen, the officer reassured her that an attempt to contact her would be made. The car was recovered quickly, but she was never notified or a call made to the number she provided. Over the weekend the car accrued over \$300.00 in impound fees, which she cannot afford.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Jun 9, 2016  
Class/sub-class: Policy Complaint  
Disposition: Dismissed-Other

RP stopped by the Auditor's Office to report he believes law enforcement is tracking his phone and following him in order to make him look like he is mentally ill and a drug addict. RP could not articulate a concrete contact with an EPD officer.

Dismiss - other.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: Jun 9, 2016  
Class/sub-class: Inquiry  
Disposition:

RP alleged that an officer basically told her he would be watching her because of the people she was hanging with. Then when she lost the trespass citation he had given her just minutes before he refused to tell her what her court date was.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: Jun 9, 2016  
Class/sub-class: Inquiry  
Disposition:

RP reported being harassed by an officer for standing in the landscape of the Park Blocks. RP noted that it is not posted that you cannot stand there. RP noted that 4 officers approached her about the issue when the park was full of other people smoking, etc. She was not cited. RP believes the officer is following her because she had given a friend a cigarette when he was being arrested previously.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: Jun 9, 2016  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance  
Disposition:

RP contacted the Auditor's Office upset when she reported a Home Invasion Assault by a previous friend, whom she learned had been stealing from her, the officer only cited him for trespass - but he has not been served with the citation yet. RP does not believe a report was even taken about the situation.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: Jun 9, 2016  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance  
Disposition:

RP reported a motorcycle officer driving aggressively on I-105.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: Jun 9, 2016  
Class/sub-class: Inquiry  
Disposition:

RP called to complain of officers unlawfully entering his back yard, rather than knocking on his door and asking permission. He demanded Chief Kerns call him back within the hour or he would go to the media or sue the department. This involved the lock down at Shelton High School. It is uncontroverted that officers entered a back yard where a gate was open.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Jun 13, 2016  
Class/sub-class: Policy Complaint /  
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP contacted the Auditor's Office very frustrated that even after calling the non-emergency number

every day for the last 2 weeks he has been unable to get illegal campers moved from in front of the apartment complex he manages. RP is very unhappy with the service level on this issue.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: Jun 14, 2016  
Class/sub-class: Policy Complaint  
Disposition:

RP reported a neighbor who moves his garbage cans and strews the contents into the road in the middle of the night a couple of times to EPD and was told there was nothing they would do. RP cannot understand why the police will not help him with the situation.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Jun 14, 2016  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance  
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP reported an issue with an online email provider and felt the person tampered with her computer she was told she needed a police report, when she called EPD she was issued an incident number, but had to call back because they wanted a report. She was told someone would get back to her in a couple of days but that never happened.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Jun 14, 2016  
Class/sub-class: Inquiry  
Disposition: Dismissed-alt remedy

RP reported an officer who she felt was picking on her for citing her for crossing the street at Broadway and Oak against the light when a car had stopped for her. The officer told her he could have arrested her for disorderly conduct, RP does not feel she did anything wrong.

Auditor Dismissed - Alternate Remedy, courts.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: Jun 16, 2016  
Class/sub-class: Inquiry  
Disposition:

RP contacted the Auditor's office with the concern that her daughter's ex-husband may have an inside connection with EPD that allows him to have officers come to her home looking for her daughter and grandchildren. When RP calls to find out about the call she is told they have no record of officers contacting her at her home.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Jun 16, 2016  
Class/sub-class: Inquiry  
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP contacted the Auditor's Office with a concern about a police report she reviewed. The incident started at her home after her neighbor called the police in the middle of the night when her child woke up and screamed. RP alleged that the report was false and that officers illegally entered her home on detaining her boyfriend at the time in handcuffs for over an hour. None of this was in the report. She was told at the time that the call was about someone possibly being murdered. The report states

officers heard a verbal dispute, her home was completely silent at the time and no mention of a call about a possible murder. RP feels the report was falsified to give officers cause to illegally enter her home without a warrant. RP believes review of ICV and call records will show how wrong the report is.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: Jun 17, 2016  
Class/sub-class: Inquiry  
Disposition:

RP reported an incident in which he had given a girl a ride to a motel, and while outside sitting in his car, he was pulled out of the vehicle at gun point by undercover police officers. The officers were conducting some sort of prostitution sting. He was taken to the police station while his car was left at the scene with his wallet and keys inside. Finally after citing him and driving him part way to the motel, the officers made him walk in his slippers in the rain the rest of the way. He found that his car was gone. When he called to report his car gone, he was told that it had been released to the girl. It was just some girl he had given a ride to; no one with legal authority to have the car which he had told officers over and over again. No report was taken, nor was he given help in finding his vehicle. After spending the night and most of the next day walking around the city, he finally found the girl at a park. She told him the police told her to take the car and that he was going to jail, while they were telling him he was only going to be cited. The property sheet was made out to her. RP also learned that the woman doesn't have a driver's license, never has, and doesn't really know how to drive. His vehicle that was running fine is now spewing smoke.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: Jun 17, 2016  
Class/sub-class: Policy Complaint  
Disposition:

Anonymous caller called the Auditor's Office upset with the entrapment project set up in his neighborhood at 15th and Polk. RP and others were given \$300 tickets for not stopping when a pedestrian put one foot off the curb and then stared at the driver. No mercy, no advising about the law, just bam \$300 tickets.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Jun 18, 2016  
Class/sub-class: Inquiry  
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP alleged that after being arrested for DUII the officer made no attempt to look for her debit card in her car; therefore she was unable to post bail.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Jun 20, 2016  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance  
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP emailed the Chief unhappy about the service he received when reporting a break in of his home by previous residents.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Jun 20, 2016  
Class/sub-class: Inquiry  
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed



RP contacted the Auditor's Office upset with the way an officer investigated her assault. RP had been told that the case was suspended because they needed to talk to her attacker, and then when she finally talked with the officer she was told no he talked to the guy that night and he said a TV fell on her and so he didn't have probable cause. RP has 8 stitches, and broken nose which did not happen from a small TV falling on her.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Jun 20, 2016  
Class/sub-class: Inquiry  
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

Officers were dispatched to the area in reference to a disorderly male swinging a baseball bat at passing cars and walking in the lanes of traffic. The RP was still uncooperative and refused officer commands. He was taken into custody without any reportable use of force being used. On the way to the jail, the RP informed the officer that he believed he had been targeted because he is a "tranny" (transsexual).

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: Jun 21, 2016  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance  
Disposition:

RP reported an incident in which she reported an unattended dog in a vehicle. The officer responded just after the owner showed up yelling at her calling her names and took the dog out of the car. The vehicle had expired Arizona plates and was parked facing the wrong way on the street. The officer never bothered to get out of her car, told her she wasn't going to do anything about any of the issues at hand and told her she best not walk down this way and she was being vengeful. RP felt punished for calling in a legitimate concern.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: Jun 21, 2016  
Class/sub-class: Policy Complaint  
Disposition:

RP reported an officer who is tagging his motorhome every 72 hours and chasing it around town to tag it again. RP believes he should be able park near his home and every vehicle in town that is not moved needs to be tagged and not just him singled out.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Jun 21, 2016  
Class/sub-class: Inquiry  
Disposition: Dismissed-alt remedy

RP alleged that a police call-in about her son prompted a prejudicial police response leading to his arrest and piled on charges. RP stated that officers ordered her son to get his hands up at gun point and then cut him out of his car and dragged him out for no reason.

Dismissed - alternative remedy.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Jun 22, 2016

Class/sub-class: Inquiry  
Disposition: Dismissed-alt remedy

An officer contacted a man near the river and arrested him for smoking meth. While at the jail the RP told the officer he believed the he was arrested due to his socio-economic status, specifically because he was homeless.

Inquiry: Dismissed - alternate remedy.

---

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

RP contacted the Auditor's Office with a concern that officers who are texting her about not contacting people who are slandering her are violating her freedom of speech. RP may be confused as to the legality of telephonic harassment issues. She feels they are not asking questions to get to the real issue.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: Jun 23, 2016  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance  
Disposition:

RP alleged that when she called EPD about a man her sister knows, who was trying to get into their home the Officer who responded told them "Have a nice night" and then left even though they told him the guy was still in the complex area. The man returned later and beat up a person. RP feels if the officer had taken the time to look around for the guy this could have been prevented.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Jun 23, 2016  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance  
Disposition: Dismissed-EE Not Identif

RP reported an unmarked police vehicle (black SUV) that pulled out of the parking lot at a high rate of speed, throwing gravel and endangering the customers.

Dismissed - Employee not Identifiable.

---

Incident type: Incident Review  
Status: Active  
Received date: Jun 23, 2016  
Class/sub-class: Inquiry  
Disposition:

A report from a person reporting her dissatisfaction with how officers from EPD handled an incident at the Eugene Airport.

---

Incident type: IA Investigation  
Status: Active  
Received date: Jun 23, 2016  
Class/sub-class: Allegation of Misconduct / Performance  
Disposition:

1101.1.B.9 Unsatisfactory Performance:

It is alleged that an officer failed to conform to the standards established for his rank or position and failed to take appropriate action by failing to timely report his direct observations of off-duty conduct by an another EPD officer that he knew, or should have known, violated one or more EPD policies.

Allegations:

Performance - 1101.1.B.9 Unsatisfactory Performance

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: Jun 23, 2016  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance  
Disposition:

RP reported trying to report identity theft to EPD after already being sent to the Sheriff's Office and sent back previously and was told by the female call taker that "You have nothing. We will not take a report." On EPD's web page she noted that Identity theft was one of the items listed that a report would be taken.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: Jun 23, 2016  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance  
Disposition:

RP reported that he was struck in the crosswalk at Coburg Road and MLK Blvd by a tow truck operated by AE towing and has been unable to get a police report taken.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Jun 26, 2016  
Class/sub-class: Inquiry /  
Disposition: Dismissed-EE Not Active

RP alleged that when an officer arrested him he placed the handcuffs on too tight and his wrists were purple and blue, even though he told him several times they were too tight.

Dismissed - Employee no longer employed.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: Jun 27, 2016  
Class/sub-class: Inquiry  
Disposition:

RP reported an incident in which one of his neighbors saw officers speaking with a couple of homeless men who live in their neighborhood, the men seemed upset and it is believed that they were told they could not use the port-a-potty in the park. RP and his neighbors inquired with EPD about the incident.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: Jun 27, 2016  
Class/sub-class: Policy Complaint  
Disposition:

A man complained about police response time about an alleged harassment call he made.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: Jun 28, 2016  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Courtesy  
Disposition:

RP was upset that three police cars stopped him while he was walking down a street near his home by yelling at him to get on the curb. He was then told that the officers were looking for a white male with a hat.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: Jun 30, 2016  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Courtesy  
Disposition:

RP contacted the Auditor's Office about a contact with EPD officers at the Costco Parking lot. Someone had seen RP's dog in his vehicle and called the Police, about his dog panting, the officer proceeded to berated him for 5-10 minutes for not having water for his dog treated him like he was a criminal when he hadn't done anything wrong. The officer finally told him he was letting him go with a warning, a warning when he hadn't done anything illegal.

---

Incident type: Auditor Intake  
Status: Initial  
Received date: Jun 30, 2016  
Disposition:

RP contacted the Auditor's Office with a concern about a Police contact. RP was walking near the LTD station when he was grabbed from behind by two officers and guided to the ground. He was then questioned about being the Hispanic person in a grainy picture and about being involved in a shooting. The officers also started taking pictures of him. RP stated there was no verbal, sir can we talk with you or anything before being grabbed, RP does not feel this was right to humiliate him on a public sidewalk.

48 incidents displayed.