

MINUTES

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

October 11, 2016
5:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Eric Van Houten, Chair; Lindsey Foltz, Vice Chair; Maurice Denner, Rick Roseta, Heather Marek, Steven McIntire, Civilian Review Board members; Mark Gissiner, Leia Pitcher, Beatrice Hernandez, Police Auditor's Office; Lt. Carolyn Mason, Eugene Police Department.

Mr. Van Houten convened the Civilian Review Board (CRB) at 5:32 p.m.

1. AGENDA AND MATERIALS REVIEW

Mr. Van Houten noted some in attendance were recording tonight's CRB meeting. He added that while he appreciated the interest in the events that transpired in the CRB, it was important to note that these recordings were not official transcripts of the meeting. The recordings had not been authenticated for accuracy or completeness, nor had they been approved by the CRB. The recording of meetings was a matter previously brought before the CRB and the board, as a body, did not approve the recordings of meetings. These recordings were the personal property of the individual who created them and were not sanctioned by the City of Eugene, the Auditor's office or the CRB.

No changes to the agenda were made.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Brian Michaels was the attorney representing Ms. Ayisha Elliot and Quinton Richardson. He was there to express shock at information falsely presented to the CRB at the last meeting regarding the case entitled: *Quinton Richardson vs. The City of Eugene*. He didn't get to read the minutes from last month's CRB meeting in which this case was discussed and he was unable to locate the audio. He stated that the description of Quinton given to the CRB was inaccurate, stating that he was taller than 6 foot 5. He added that someone on the CRB noted that they had a friend in excess of 6 foot 5 who was aware of how he was perceived due to his size. Mr. Michaels said Quinton was around 6 foot 1, weighing 200-210 pounds at the time of the incident. He asked that the CRB to question why Quinton's size was exaggerated and what else might have been exaggerated. It was important to consider viewing this case in terms of racial bias. He argued that the EPD might have felt that citizens were more sympathetic to their actions if they thought the actions involved the intimidating and imposing figure of a large black man. Mr. Michaels reported that Ms. Elliot was still suffering from symptoms of concussion, and back pain from having been thrown to the floor. Mr. Michaels clarified that after Quinton walked out of the house onto the porch, he was cooperatively handcuffed. He suggested that Quinton was not threatening and suggested that if incident involved a white woman and a white son, the officers would not have felt threatened. He added that the incident happened so fast that there was no de-escalation, but rather a constant sense of escalation.

Ms. Ayisha Elliot confirmed that her son, Quinton, was 6 foot 2 and weighed 215 pounds at the time of the incident. She stated that some information was skipped over in the testimony presented to the CRB. She said that she came out to the porch and talked with the EPD officers for a minute and a half about what was going on with Quinton, what had already happened, what she had done, and informed the

officer that Quinton had Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI), and that she was going to go back into the house to get Quinton. The officers were prepared for the situation because she shared this information with them prior to bringing Quinton out. She said that Quinton wasn't aggressive and while they were talking with the first police officer; Quinton turned to talk with the other police officer and was subsequently handcuffed. Ms. Elliot said the officer standing at a distance told Quinton he would tase him and she saw a red light on Quinton. She turned and put her arms around Quinton and told the officers if they had a taser or a gun, then they needed to get off her property. The next thing she knew was she was thrown to the floor and no one spoke to her while she was on the ground. The officer was on her back and Quinton was to her right; she and Quinton yelled back to one another to stay calm. The officer slammed her head to the ground at least three times. She was then arrested. She emphasized that the testimony reported a hectic incident, but in actuality there were parts to the incident that were not reported, such as the calm conversation she had with the officers before bringing Quinton out of the house.

3. MINUTES APPROVAL— September 14, 2016

Mr. McIntire noted an error on page 3, under the bullet point that began with “code of conduct on integrity...” He asked that the following information be added to the bullet point: he made a motion to bring the code of conduct policy back for review and that motion passed.

Mr. McIntire noted another error on page 7, under “Relevant Department Policies and Practice” on the bullet point that began with, “Mr. McIntire stated that Officer C;” he asked that the words “demand and control” be changed to “command and control.” He added that there was an error on the same page, two bullet points down. It should read, “Mr. McIntire asked if **CIT** Training...”

Ms. Marek said there was an error on page 3, at the end of the second full paragraph; the url should have read “www.tinyurl.com/crbaudio”

Mr. Roseta added that his name was missing from the list of those present.

With the changes presented, the minutes were deemed approved without objection.

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

Ms. Marek shared that she was recording tonight's CRB meeting. The audio could be accessed online at tinyurl.com/crbaudio. She announced that at the next Human Rights Commission there would be a presentation on a proposed policy that required citizen participation before police could implement new technology. She added that the Oregon Supreme Court handed down a decision that involved the CRB American Civil Liberties Union of Oregon based in the City of Eugene. Under Oregon public records law, the public had the right to examine public records, but there was an exception for situations where it involved investigative records that dealt with the discipline of officials. There was an exception to that exception that allowed for disclosure of disciplinary findings if there was a significant public interest. The lower court found that the CRB struck a balance between the public's interest in disclosure and the government's interest in confidentiality. However, the Oregon Supreme reversed and stated that when considering those competing interests, there was a presumption in favor of disclosure. When the interests in confidentiality and disclosure were competing and equal, disclosure won. Public interest in disclosure extended beyond disclosure of police records but also to CRB itself. Ms. Marek argued that this was relevant to the CRB because while discussing whether or not to resume audio recording the CRB meetings, the lower court decision was included in the CRB packet as evidence for why it was not necessary

to record. Ms. Marek perceived that there were arguments made that there was no need for recordings because if the CRB was doing a good job reviewing cases, then that was oversight enough and no need for recordings. Ms. Marek argued that this argument was circular because it suggested that because the CRB was doing a good job, the public did not need to ensure that they were doing a good job. This assumed that the CRB would be incapable of doing a poor job. In conclusion, Ms. Marek suggested that the strong statement made by the Oregon Supreme Court's reversal should make the argument to record each CRB meeting even more persuasive.

Mr. McIntire stated that from his perspective, the discussion about recording CRB meetings was about whether audio or video recordings should be allowed. He stated that the CRB had written minutes and public record law allowed for written or audio recording.

Mr. Van Houten thanked Mr. Michaels and Ms. Elliot for their public comments. He added that the members of the CRB felt it was important to recognize what implicit bias was and how to consider it in regards to police work. He reported that the CRB was working toward training on bias so that the board could continue to expand their understanding of implicit bias. Mr. Van Houten added that the Oregon Supreme Court ruling was exciting. He emphasized there were many occasions where transparency was good for the community. However, Oregon had strict employee records laws and the CRB had to work within them. He didn't believe the CRB should revisit whether or not they should record audio. The CRB needed to follow its own processes accurately.

Ms. Foltz stated that when police reform was discussed, it was important to recognize that it was not necessarily a national incident, but rather a local issue and localized action was needed to see systemic reform enacted. She added that she supported transparency and would continue to be an advocate for more ability for the public to view the kinds of records that the CRB saw. It was important for accountability. She thought the CRB was abiding to the law by having robust written minutes. She was also of the opinion that audio recording was helpful and was not harmful.

Mr. Denner wanted to clarify, in response to Mr. Michael's public comment, that he was the CRB member who noted he had a friend of a large size who was aware of how their size was perceived by others.

Mr. Gissiner clarified that, in regards to the Quinton Richardson vs. City of Eugene case, the auditor's office found and the CRB agreed that the officer who took Ms. Elliot to the ground used excessive force and failed to perform policy standards of EPD.

5. CASE REVIEW: Complaint Related to investigation of a menacing incident

Ms. Pitcher offered a PowerPoint presentation entitled *Case Summaries—Civilian Review Board—October 11, 2016* and facilitated a discussion on the case before the CRB.

Summary of Facts

- Officer A was dispatched to a report of a physical dispute, along with two other employees. They contacted the victim outside her residence, where she explained that she had been in a physical dispute with an ex.
- Officer A asked about injuries; the victim explained that she was fine but probably had bruising. She stated that there was a shotgun and ammunition in her house. She went over the incident more than once with Officer A.
- Officer A told her he would be writing an incident report and that he did not think that this

rose to the level of an Abuse Prevention Act arrest. Officer A advised that the victim should consider getting a restraining order. Victim replied, "I've already had one."

- Officer A did not follow up on the restraining order statement. Officer A asked the victim about the shotgun; the victim responded that the suspect had picked up the gun and threatened to hit her with it. Officer A turned to Officer B and said something similar to, "May not get out of here on time."
- Officer A asked some clarification questions and informed the victim that this information changed things, and it was now a mandatory arrest situation.
- Officer A and cover officers went to the victim's residence to search for the suspect, but he was gone. The involved shotgun was located on the floor of the residence, but it was not seized.
- The victim advised the officers of a one-block area where the suspect was living with a relative; she did not know the specific address.
- An audit of the records system showed that Officer A did not run the suspect's name through that system. Officer B ran the suspect through DMV to try and obtain a current address. There was no information that the suspect was run through the records department.
- Officers did not discover that the suspect was a felon with a valid restraining order against him, protecting the victim in this case.
- Officer C assisted in a later investigation where probable cause existed to arrest the suspect; Officer C was able to obtain his address via an Internet search. The suspect was contacted and arrested for all charges at that address.
- While preparing for trial of the suspect, the District Attorney's office developed concerns about how Officer A investigated this case and handled the follow up with the DA. The DA then reported their concerns to EPD.

Allegations

1. Unsatisfactory Performance: That Officer A failed to take appropriate action, as required by ORS 133.055 and POM 320.4.g, when he failed to take reasonable steps to effect the arrest of a suspect.
2. Courtesy: That Officer A used insolent language in the presence of the victim during an investigation

Recommended Adjudication

1. Unsatisfactory Performance
 - EPD chain of command: Sustained
 - Auditor's Office: Sustained
 - Chief's Adjudication: Sustained
2. Courtesy
 - EPD chain of command: Unfounded
 - Auditor's Office: Sustained
 - Chief's Adjudication: Unfounded

Issues for CRB Discussion

- Complaint Intake and Classification
 - Mr. Denner recognized that this case did not go before the auditor's office until the ADA, who was prosecuting another case, made reference to it. He argued that there needed to be a certain level of redundancy a supervisor in the chain of command looked at anything

that was a serious misdemeanor or felony and there was no arrest. He added that the Eugene Police Employee's Association had a commitment from the City of Eugene that there was a clock that started at the six month point. He thought this agreement needed to be flushed out because there would be cases where the facts were not discovered until later.

- Mr. Van Houten appreciated that the CRB was able to examine the role of the investigative officer. He asked if there had ever been a complaint brought forward by the ADA. He appreciated that it was brought forth by the ADA.
- Ms. Foltz echoed Mr. Denner's comment, stating that the six-month period needed to be examined more closely. She felt the period should be extended.
- Lt. Mason stated that the six-month period was a contention in recent cases and there was discussion between the City of Eugene and the Union to have specific language on whether the period was six months from the date of the incident or six months from the date that an issue was discovered.
- Complaint Investigation and Monitoring
 - Mr. Van Houten complimented Sgt. Crompton on his investigative skill and how he handled himself.
 - Mr. Roseta agreed, stating that the IA was very thorough and objective.
 - Mr. McIntire agreed with Mr. Roseta and Mr. Van Houten's statements.
 - Mr. Denner agreed that the investigation was very thorough and professional. He believed that there was an additional line of questioning that would have opened some additional concerns. Officer A made a statement about not running the offender's name and birthdate because he didn't expect to encounter the subject that evening. Mr. Denner believed that statement suggested the officer did not plan to investigate the incident further.
 - Ms. Foltz wasn't sure if it was a common practice to let the deputy auditor be present in interviews. She was glad that it happened in this case because it was useful to have a different perspective.
 - Mr. Gissiner reported that the Statute allowed the IA and one representative from the auditor's off to be present in interviews.
- Relevant Department Policies and Practices
 - Mr. Denner was concerned that the officer did not identify the victim and the subject in route to the call. He also expressed concern that the victim was left on the street corner by herself. He argued that this devalued the victim and what she experienced. Even putting her safely in the back of a police car, or someone staying with her would have been best.
 - Mr. McIntire asked if it was policy or practice that stated an officer did not need to run a suspect because they were not in the officer's presence.
 - Sgt. Crompton said there was no such policy or practice. There was an expectation that an officer should run any individual that they receive a call on. He said this expectation was trained through coaching and mentoring.
 - Mr. Roseta commented on the treatment of the victim. He said the CRB should consider the fact that all three officers were needed to check the victim's house. He thought the treatment of the victim might be seen differently if something bad had happened to two officers when they went into the house while leaving one officer outside with the victim. He suggested that perhaps it would have been appropriate for the officers to ask the victim if she did not want to be left alone.
 - Mr. Van Houten asked for clarification on the policy on courtesy. He thought it was weak due to the fact that it was broad and lacking in description. It did not provide officers with

- clear guidance. He appreciated Sgt. Crompton's comments about using a supervisor. Mr. Van Houten felt as if though the officer did not use his supervisor.
- Ms. Foltz had a question about why the officer did not run the perpetrator's information. She felt that there was not a satisfactory reason given. She asked if there would be any reason why an officer would avoid running a perpetrator.
 - Sgt. Crompton said it was much easier to run someone before the new RMS system. Now, officers had to go through three systems to run someone properly, if officers themselves did it. A lot of officers go to station two and ask for information on someone. As workload increases and staffing decreases, officers were expected to run information on someone themselves. He added that calling records was another way that officers could gather information on someone.
 - Ms. Foltz described the officer's behavior as calloused toward the victim. The officer made several comments and demonstrated dismissive behavior about the victim.
 - Ms. Marek asked for further clarification on the policy for running information on suspects. She had a sense that the officer could have done more. However, she was unsure if it was fair to hold an officer to a standard that was not clear.
 - Sgt. Crompton noted there was an ORS that stated steps to take in an APA situation. It stated that all reasonable means in trying to apprehend should be exhausted. His expectations were that for an officer's own safety, information on a suspect should be run. He reiterated that this was based on training and experience. He added that the officer in question was not a new officer, and should have run information on the suspect.
 - Lt. Mason reported that the ORS statue that was being discussed had been part of annual DV investigation training.
- Policy and/or Training Considerations
 - Ms. Marek was concerned about the reenactment of the violence and wondered about training around that.
 - Lt. Mason stated that training included forensic experiential trauma interviewing (FETI). Lt. Mason was considering how to include FETI training in the EPD in-service training. She added that trauma informed care was also being considered for further trainings.
 - Ms. Foltz asked if the reenactment of violence was something the officer was trained to do.
 - Sgt. Crompton stated it was not something the officer was trained to do.
 - Ms. Foltz was concerned about the lack of victim care. She wanted to know more about training that existed around care for victims.
 - Sgt. Crompton said it was possible to become desensitized as a police officer. However, officers were trained in understanding the psychology behind victims of domestic violence and why domestic violence continued to happen. He suggested that perhaps the officer didn't think about this and was desensitized to domestic violence calls. Empathy was necessary.
 - Mr. Van Houten thought Sgt. Crompton's comment accurately described courtesy.
 - Mr. Roseta agreed. He said that Sgt. Crompton's description caused him to rethink his view of the insolence of the officer in question.
 - Mr. Denner suggested that peer review and peer coaching might be a good way to approach a situation as egregious as this one. He suggested that sometimes, if someone isn't performing in the right way, the top-down approach might not be the best way to address the behavior.
 - Ms. Pitcher agreed that the courtesy policy needed improvement and suggested that during the code of conduct review, the policy on courtesy be reviewed, as well.

- Adjudication Recommendations
 - Mr. Denner agreed with the adjudication on unsatisfactory performance. He added that he would have sustained the adjudication on courtesy for all the reasons discussed and for leaving the victim alone on the street.
 - Mr. McIntire would sustain on unsatisfactory performance and courtesy. He added that the courtesy adjudication was focused on the comment “not going to get out of here on time.” To him that was not something of major concern, but rather the officer’s disinterest, and lack of respect for the victim should have been of concern.
 - Mr. Roseta agreed that both courtesy and unsatisfactory performance should have been sustained. He thought it was good that the ADA brought this up, but that this was not an issue to be taken up by the CRB, rather, it should have been taken up with the Police.
 - Mr. Van Houten agreed with sustained on both courtesy and unsatisfactory performance.
 - Ms. Foltz agreed on sustained for both.
 - Ms. Marek agreed on sustained on both.

- Additional Comments/Concerns

Mr. Gissiner complimented Ms. Pitcher on all of her work for this case. He said she was vigilant in making sure the case moved forward and she did a great job.

Mr. Van Houten complimented Sgt. Crompton on his listening and interviewing skills.

6. INQUIRY REVIEW: Complaint related to police contact regarding trespassing at a school

Ms. Pitcher offered a PowerPoint presentation entitled *Case Summaries—Civilian Review Board—October 11, 2016* and facilitated a discussion on the case before the CRB.

Summary of Facts

- Officer A was contacted by school officials regarding two people trespassing on the campus of a school and reportedly using the school’s port-a-potty. Officer A contacted the two individuals and explained that they could not be on school property. He explained the division between school property and park property. No citations were issued.
- Some people in the neighborhood reported to a police commissioner that Officer A was harassing the individuals. The police commissioner notified EPD, and Officer A’s supervisor spoke with Officer A, the person who reported the incident to the police commissioner and the police commissioner.
- Officer A’s actions were found to be within policy, and the complaint was closed.

Discussion

- Ms. Marek said she was the board member that had questions about this case because it wasn’t clear to her how it was resolved or how the officer became involved with individuals spoken to. Ms. Marek’s questions were about how the officer knew the individuals were trespassing, and whether or not the school was participating in the trespass program, or if the officers were called to the scene. She said it was clear from the packet that the officer was called. Her concern was that the officers enforced trespassing laws against people who looked a certain way or whom they know did not belong. After reviewing the case materials, her concerns weren’t entirely addressed. She didn’t have enough information to know if the officer did anything wrong. She had concerns about the investigation itself. She believed there was evidence to suggest that the officer was

enforcing trespass laws on public property. The auditor's office and the person investigating this case took it at face value based on what the officer said. The witness saw the officer enforcing trespassing laws on public land. There were port-a-potties on public land in the adjacent park, as well as some at the intersection of Kidsport, the school, and the field. Ms. Marek expressed concern that the individuals may have been on public property. Even if the school called it in, it was not clear that the individuals were trespassing because the port-a-potties were not on school property. The officer said he knew these people, and that they often came to the school. Ms. Marek felt as if the individuals may have been profiled. She was unsatisfied and hoped the complaints were taken seriously and investigated with rigor. She emphasized that even though the individuals were not ticketed, the police engagement could have had negative implications such as embarrassment, loss of time, and erosion of trust in the police force. She emphasized that when complaints were not investigated, it undermined credibility of the process.

- Mr. Denner suspected that there was not a dispatch record because it was possible that the school had access to the safer schools officer's cell phone number. The school official may have called the officer and asked for direct assistance to talk to individuals. If the officer was free then they would come to the school that was calling, or they would call station two and see if anyone was available to take the call.
- Ms. Pitcher confirmed Mr. Denner's explanation. The call was to the cell phone of the school's resource officer.
- Mr. Denner guessed, based on the time of the call, that the principal was outside supervising lunch break and called from the site. He asked Ms. Marek for more explanation about the trespass program.
- Ms. Marek said the trespass program allowed officers to enforce the trespass laws even if the property owner did not call them.
- Mr. Denner appreciated that this case gave the CRB the chance to look at the possibility that profiling was taking place either by the community or by the department. He was satisfied with the supervisor's investigation and reporting.
- Mr. McIntire wondered why the CRB reviewed this case. From what he understood, this case began because a passing motorist sent a short email complaining about the incident. Mr. McIntire emphasized that this witness could not hear what was going on and did not know whether or not the individuals were ticketed. He emphasized that the police commissioner was satisfied with the investigation. He felt that many assumed that any interaction with an officer was negative. However, the report indicated that there was discussion and laughter between the individuals and the officer. He felt it was unnecessary to review this case as it was sufficiently responded to and investigated already.
- Mr. Roseta suggested that the witness who complained might have been implicitly biased against police. He said the school officials saw the individuals on school property and they used the port-a-potties on school property, which was possible because the school building was under construction. By the time the police officer got there the individuals had moved off school property. Mr. Roseta agreed with Mr. McIntire. He did not believe there was any harm done to the individuals and they did not want the complaint to be proceeded with. There could have been some minor loss of time and damage in some way by being contacted by an officer, but he argued that it was not at any level to be concerned with.
- Mr. Van Houten appreciated that the community cared about the two individuals so much.
- Ms. Foltz appreciated that any individual from the CRB could have a concern and have all of the CRB examine it. She did not find anything particularly problematic about this interaction. She understood Ms. Marek's concern about differential enforcement of the trespass law based on the

identity of the individuals and that it was unclear whether or not they were on public property. Ms. Foltz appreciated that when community members were concerned there was a way they could address their concern.

- Ms. Marek stated that she would have been more satisfied with the case if there had been more conversation with the officer and the school to ensure that the individuals weren't being pushed off of public property.
- Mr. Denner reported that there would be direction from the Oregon Supreme Court on a school's authority. He said as a school administrator, he used to assume responsibility for the children in school from the time they left their homes until they returned home. He reported that a case from the Eugene school district would be reviewed because it entailed a young person was prosecuted for harassment that occurred after school and on public property in a park adjacent to the school. He thought that case would be reviewed in terms of considering how much schools were responsible for the safety of the students.

7. ELECTIONS

Mr. McIntire seconded by Mr. Denner, nominated Mr. Van Houten for Chair of the CRB. The nomination carried unanimously, 5:0.

Ms. Foltz, seconded by Mr. Roseta moved to close the nominations for Chair of the CRB. The motion carried unanimously, 5:0.

Mr. McIntire seconded by Mr. Denner, nominated Ms. Foltz as Vice-Chair of the CRB. The motion carried unanimously, 5:0.

Mr. Roseta, seconded by Mr. McIntire, moved to close the nominations for Vice-Chair of the CRB. The motion carried unanimously, 5:0.

Mr. Van Houten asked Mr. McIntire if he was willing to continue to serve as the Police Commission Liaison. Mr. McIntire indicated that he was willing to continue to serve.

Mr. Denner, seconded by Mr. Roseta, moved to forward the nomination of Mr. McIntire to serve as Police Commission Liaison to the Council for appointment. The motion passed unanimously, 5:0.

Mr. Van Houten asked Ms. Marek if she was interested in continuing to serve as the Human Rights Commission (HRC) Liaison. Ms. Marek indicated that she was interested in continuing to serve, but stated that she had a time conflict that would cause her to leave the HRC meetings early during some months. She suggested that this was an opportunity for someone else to serve if there was interest. Ms. Pitcher indicated that if Ms. Marek needed to miss a meeting, others from the CRB could attend the HRC meeting in her place.

Mr. Roseta, seconded by Mr. Denner, moved to forward the nomination of Ms. Marek to serve as Human Right Commission Liaison to the Council for appointment. The motion passed unanimously, 5:0.

8. AUDITOR REPORT

Mr. Gissiner reported that the next CRB meeting was planned for Wednesday, November 9, 2016. It was a joint meeting of the Police Commission. He suggested this was a good opportunity to have a discussion

about how police officers should behave when a colleague was misbehaving, in regards to policy improvement or enforcement of current policies.

Mr. Gissiner added that Dr. Johnny Lake was planned to give implicit bias presentation. Mr. Gissiner hoped to schedule his presentation for December or February. The police commission would also be attend the presentation.

Mr. Gissiner reported that he attended the Law Enforcement Coordinating Committee (LECC) meeting in Salem. He said the legislature and the governor signed a response to profiling in which police departments were supposed to submit data to the staff people at Portland State University for analysis. So far, only two police departments had supplied data for analysis. Mr. Gissiner reported that a critic of an officer involved shooting included the practice of an Oregon State Police person writing down a summary of their perception of the interview with the officer. Now, a stenographer would be present in the interview to take down every word.

Mr. Gissiner reported that there would be a Bethel quarterly meeting on October 19, 2016 where Vickie Cox and Beatrice Hernandez planned to give a presentation about the Auditor's office.

Mr. Gissiner added that the former Assistant Chief was appointed to the President's commission on 21 Century Policing. He believed this was due to the fact that EPD was considered a leader of Blue Team routine use of force.

9. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT UPDATE

Ms. Hernandez reported an overview of what she had been working on in her new position. Primarily she had been creating and updating materials. So far she:

- was creating a frequently asked questions brochure in Spanish and English
- created bilingual "know your rights" wallet cards
- updated the online Spanish complaint form
- created a Spanish option for the Auditor's Office phone
- updated an in depth PowerPoint presentation and translated it into Spanish
- created a new color flyer to place in key high traffic areas
- was working on a student guide to police practices
- created social media accounts (Facebook and Twitter) for the Police Auditor's Office

Ms. Hernandez reported that the Police Auditor's office had a new logo and all new materials would include the logo. She added that she planned to reach out to non-profit organizations to give brief presentations about the Police Auditor's Office. MS. Hernandez asked the CRB members for a brief message about the CRB that she could then convey to the public.

Ms. Foltz suggested that is people expressed being part of the CRB, that Ms. Hernandez could provide information on that process.

Mr. Gissiner stated that the non-profit outreach also included Springfield because many Springfield residents work or spend time in Eugene.

Mr. Van Houten suggested that CRB members send Ms. Hernandez their comments about the CRB by email.

Mr. Denner asked that forms and handouts developed for the public be forwarded to the CRB members so they were aware of the information the public was receiving about the CRB.

10. ADJOURN

Mr. McIntire, seconded by Mr. Denner moved to adjourn the CRB meeting. The motion carried unanimously, 5:0. The meeting adjourned at 7:46 p.m.

(Recorded by Emily Mathis)