



## 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, January 9, 2018 - 5:30 p.m.**  
Harris Hall, Lane County Public Service Building  
125 East 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
**Contact: Vicki Cox, 682-5016**

<b><u>ITEM</u></b>	<b><u>TIME (Starting)</u></b>
1. Agenda and Materials Review	5 minutes (5:30 pm)
2. Public Comment	5 minutes (5:35 pm)
3. Minutes Approval (Minutes from November meeting)	5 minutes (5:40 pm)
4. Comments from Board Members, Human Rights Commission Liaison and Police Commission Liaison	10 minutes (5:45 pm)
5. Introduction of Interim Director of Public Safety David James	10 minutes (5:55 pm)
6. Training Topic: Discussion of Police Executive Research Forum Report on EPD	30 minutes (6:05 pm)
7. Break	10 minutes (6:35 pm)
8. Case Review: Allegation of a Untruthfulness During an Administrative Investigation	50 minutes (6:45 pm)
9. Auditor Report	15 minutes (7:35 pm)
10. Adjourn – Next Meeting February 13, 2018	(7:50 pm)

## **MINUTES**

Civilian Review Board  
Harris Hall, Lane County Public Service Building  
125 East 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue

November 16, 2017  
5:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Chris Wig, Chair; Rick Roseta; Steve McIntire; Maurice Denner, Vice Chair; Carolyn Williams; Jim Hargreaves; Heather Marek;, Civilian Review Board members; Mark Gissiner, Leia Pitcher, Beatrice Hernandez, Police Auditor's Office; Ron Tinseth, Eugene Police Department.

Mr. Wig convened the Civilian Review Board (CRB) at 5:30 p.m.

### **1. AGENDA AND MATERIALS REVIEW**

Mr. Wig added an item to the agenda after the case review and asked that CRB vote on its next case for the January meeting, as the case reviewed that evening had a subsequent part. Mr. Wig explained part one covered the incident that occurred, and part two included additional information found during the investigation.

In response to a question from Mr. Hargreaves, Mr. Wig explained the usual process for selecting a case for review. Mr. Wig thought the gravity of the case required the full board's weigh in as to whether they should see the second part. Mr. Hargreaves asked what material came to light after the initial case. Mr. Wig said it came to light that someone was dishonest during the internal review.

Mr. Wig deemed the agenda approved as amended by acclamation.

### **2. PUBLIC COMMENT**

Lindsey Foltz introduced herself, and said she brought CRB academic research on sexual harassment in law enforcement. She shared an article published in Police Quarterly in 2013. The article surveyed 531 female officers and was part a series of studies with relatively similar findings. Findings were 93% respondents indicated they experienced gender based or sexual harassment, and 92.5% of those incidents were in the past year.

Ms. Foltz said it was important to indicate sexual or gender based harassment was frequent and common for women in policing. In addition, more than 80% of women do not report those cases. Reasons to not report included fear of retaliation, fear of being treated differently by a supervisor or colleague, fear of not be taken seriously, or because no action had been taken in past after prior complaints. Ms. Foltz said in context of harassment in general, it was not just one story but women experienced it pervasively in American culture, and in policing it was especially high. She said it was under reported and there were

specific reasons for why that was true. Also, linked to the study was that women who were in male dominated professions, such as police or fire, experienced higher levels of that type of behavior. She noted women in supervisory roles especially faced even higher instances.

Mr. Wig asked Ms. Foltz to send him the article, and he would relay to CRB.

### **3. MINUTES APPROVAL — October 2017**

Mr. Denner made a correction on page two, where it read “~~Sergeant Crompton would be promoted,~~” it should have read that Mr. Denner asked if “Sergeant Crompton was being transferred.” On page six, it appeared the rest of the sentence was cut off. The sentence read “~~Mr. Denner said in Washington~~” and it should have read “Mr. Denner said in Washington D.C., officers must return to the station if recording equipment was not working.”

Mr. McIntire corrected the spelling of his name on page 2 of the October 2017 minutes.

Ms. Marek said on page 11, the minutes read “~~it was not clear to her that it was constitutionally required to use force,~~” when what she meant was “it was not constitutionally permissible to use force.” In the next sentence, it read “~~she noted the subject had something in their pocket, and often people keep weapons in their pocket,~~” but Ms. Marek wanted the minutes to read “she noted the subject had something in their pocket, and often people keep weapons in pocket, but she had no reason to believe there was a weapon in that instance.” Finally, on page 13, “~~Ms. Marek did not think that using a Taser met any criteria of the policy~~” but she meant “Ms. Marek did not think facts of the case justified use of a Taser under criteria of the policy.”

**MOTION:** Mr. Roseta, seconded by Mr. McIntire, moved to approve the October 2017 Civilian Review Board (CRB) Meeting minutes as amended. The motion carried, unanimously.

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

Mr. Denner said the 2017 Police Executive Research Forum report had been released. A few items stood out to him that came up at CRB in the past, and were mentioned in the PERF report, including material on trainings, reporting, promotions, and evaluations. He said PERF was a good organization for analyzing what police officers did, because PERF looked at many different cities and different programs. Mr. Denner thought the report was good background for CRB’s mission. Mr. Gissiner would email the report to CRB.

Mr. McIntire said the police commission had an October presentation on guardian mentality versus the warrior mentality. In November, there was a report regarding body worn cameras and the PERF report. He said the last time PERF had released a report was 2005 and there had been movement on several issues, such as the review and promotion processes. What stood out to him was the focus on leadership needing more transparency and better communication. He said there were also sections on accountability, inclusiveness, and sexual harassment.

Mr. McIntire said the Police Commission received a presentation on a strategic business plan which had a focus on the promotion process. He noted an element of the plan came from the PERF report and was around testing. The idea was to craft the process in a way to focus more on the individual, with less emphasis on scores, because someone could test poorly but still be very effective in a leadership position. Mr. McIntire hoped there would be more participation with the PERF report in the future, because participation was around 51%; however, with open ended questions they found participation to rise to 63%.

Ms. Marek reported she would record CRB meetings whenever she was present, and the recordings would be available online at: [www.tinyurl.com/crbaudio](http://www.tinyurl.com/crbaudio).

Mr. Wig said a report commissioned by Oregon State Sheriff's Association and the Oregon Association of Chiefs of Police was recently released. The report was titled "Mental Health Task Force Executive Summary: A Right Response for Law Enforcement Encounters with People in a Mental Health Crisis." He noted the report pertained to many issues in Eugene. He requested Ms. Pitcher send the PERF report, the Mental Health report, and the article provided by Ms. Foltz to CRB members. In addition, Mr. Wig noted Portland City Club released an article on addiction and treatment.

Mr. Wig said the case reviewed that evening was of high profile. He asked members be extra careful to avoid names or identifying information, even if members in the community already knew who CRB was discussing. He said the case had been on his mind for a long time, especially recently as people had been posting on social media with #metoo. Mr. Wig felt the case was even more poignant than a year ago, when it was first in the queue for CRB review, and that it was too important to let fall through the cracks.

## **5. ELECTION OF HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION LIAISON**

Mr. Wig said last month, CRB decided to put off the election of a Human Rights Commission Liaison. Mr. Denner was willing to take the position for a year if CRB so chose.

**MOTION:** Mr. Hargreaves, seconded by Mr. Roseta, moved to elect Mr. Denner as the Human Rights Commission liaison. The motion carried, unanimously.

Ms. Hernandez gave a report on behalf of Human Rights Commission. She said the dog ban was discussed, which had 69 field contacts 18 citations in total. There was a Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) debrief, and City Council allocated \$10,000 and the only requirement was residing in Eugene. Finally, the commission discussed the upcoming International Human Rights Day.

Mr. Wig wanted to ensure that all CRB members received an invitation to a joint meeting of the Police Commission, CRB, and Human Rights Commission for a presentation on 21<sup>st</sup> century policing. He said it would be insightful and hoped CRB would be well represented.

Mr. Denner made a disclosure of interest. He said he knew several principals named in the case review. Mr. Denner said he wanted to be transparent, but because CRB did not vote or come to any sort of decision, he did not feel he needed to exclude himself from the discussion.

Mr. Roseta had a similar situation. He said 15 years ago, one individual involved came into his office and sought his advice in a matter involving a labor issue. Mr. Roseta said it went no further than that discussion. Even so, he wanted to recuse himself from any discussion because technically, he achieved a client-attorney relationship with the individual.

## **6. CASE REVIEW: ALLEGATION OF A VIOLATION OF THE CITY'S RESPECTFUL WORK ENVIRONMENT POLICY**

Ms. Pitcher shared presented a PowerPoint on the case.

### Summary of the Facts

- The Police Auditor's office received an anonymous complaint in March 2016 alleging that inappropriate conduct had occurred between Supervisor A and Lower-level Supervisor B, and that the investigation and treatment of the conduct by the City and EPD had been inadequate.
- The office conducted an intake interview with Lower-level Supervisor B, who stated that Supervisor A (who is of a higher rank) had taken a picture of her chest without her consent and despite her objection.
- Lower-level Supervisor B had mentioned the incident to her immediate supervisor, who reported it to Human Resources. HR met with Lower-level Supervisor B and Supervisor A separately and discussed their recollections of the incident. Those recollections were the basis of an HR report that was submitted to EPD in December 2015.
- The office's preliminary investigation (conducted upon receipt of the complaint) included review of the HR investigative report. Finding that report to be inadequate, the complaint was classified as an allegation of misconduct; specifically, a violation of the City's Respectful Work Environment policy.
- An outside investigator was retained to perform the investigation, which included recorded interviews with both of the involved parties and witnesses with whom they discussed the incident. The investigation was submitted to the City in October 2016.
- The office reviewed the investigation and found it to be unbiased and complete. Our recommendation to Chief Kerns, submitted later in October 2016, was that the allegation be sustained.
- Chief Kerns issued his initial adjudication issued in January 2017; at that time he stated that the evidence did not meet the threshold for violation of the City's RWE policy.
- The office received new information related to this investigation in March 2017. At that time, the investigation was re-opened and re-assigned to the outside investigator for follow up.
- At the conclusion of the re-opened investigation, our office found no need to submit an additional adjudication recommendation, as our recommendation had not changed. Chief Kerns re-adjudicated the case in July 2017.
- A separate, but related, investigation resulted from the receipt of new information in March 2017. That investigation was not under review at that night's meeting. The adjudication of that investigation was incomplete at the time casebooks were created. The CRB may elect to review that case at a later meeting.

### Allegations

1. **Respectful Work Environment:** That Supervisor A's actions in taking a photo of Lower-level Supervisor B violated the City's policy promoting a respectful workplace.

#### Recommended Adjudications

1. Respectful Work Environment
  - Auditor's Office: Sustained
  - Chief (initially): Did Not Meet Threshold
  - Chief (final): Sustained

#### Issues for CRB Discussion

- Complaint Intake and Classification
  - Received via an apparently third-party anonymous complaint; Auditor's Office followed up with intake interview
  - Classification: Allegation of Misconduct

Ms. Marek thought the independent investigation went well. She said with the overall independent investigation, she was pleased with the interviews, and thought they were thorough and respectful. However, she was disappointed to hear that after the complaint was filed with Human Resources (HR), the alleged victim and perpetrator did not hear anything for at least 6 weeks, which cause a lot of discomfort for both. She appreciated that case was reopened when new information came up.

Mr. Denner said he thought it was alleged that the photographs were shared with a person outside of the agency. He felt that if he was trying to create an issue around a respectful work environment, sharing those photographs would be especially disrespectful. He thought that point was well made at several steps in the case. As for intake, he was bothered by the lack of clarity from HR. Mr. Denner believed HR should have delegated the intake interviews as soon as they knew they could not conduct them properly, even if they had to go to City Manager's Office. He felt it was a symptom of disrespect.

Mr. Wig thanked Ms. Marek for her comments regarding how the reporting party was treated. He said the situation sounded like it created a lot of anxiety for her at work. It was unfortunate that it could have been rectified with a phone call or an email.

Ms. Williams said once the complaint reached the auditors' office, it was well handled investigated thoroughly.

Mr. Gissiner said when the ordinance in the charter was written, he was certain it was not envisioned that the Police Auditor's office would be responsible for HR and Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) investigations. However, the ordinance allowed employees to come into the Police Auditor's office regarding cases that could be considered serious misconduct. Given the nature of the HR investigation at that time, Mr. Gissiner opened the case as an allegation of serious misconduct.

Mr. Wig clarified that if the investigation had been handled differently, the Police Auditor would not have been involved. Mr. Gissiner said the primary responsibility was HR, though the ordinance permitted the Police Auditor to explore EEOC cases. Mr. Wig asked whether lower level Supervisor B submitted the

complaint. Mr. Gissiner said the Police Auditors Office received an anonymous complaint; the office then contacted the person involved, and that person was willing to provide a statement.

- **Complaint Investigation and Monitoring**

Mr. McIntire said he was somewhat confused by the report CRB reviewed. He thought the city's HR department did an inadequate job investigating the case. As he was reviewing the case, the subsequent investigation stopped when the Chief opinioned that the investigation was inconclusive. However, Mr. McIntire did not see that the case as being inconclusive in the external investigation, and felt he was missing information. In addition, HR alluded to additional party, but Mr. McIntire clarified that could be part two of the case which CRB had not yet seen.

Mr. Denner said he had trouble with the investigation and interview. He thought the choice of HR to conduct an initial meeting in a public restaurant was horrible. Mr. Denner said it was very disrespectful, and spoke badly of the city. Mr. Denner said there were many missing pieces, which Mr. McIntire had mentioned. He suspected they were in HR notes that were not public. Mr. Gissiner said to best of his knowledge, what CRB saw was the entire HR investigative process.

Mr. Denner thought the independent investigator, who interviewed several people, rambled and did not approach the issue with a real sense of what they wanted to learn. As various issues came up, the investigator did not circle back around and clarify those issues. Mr. Denner thought employees were treated disrespectfully.

Ms. Williams said the original investigation by HR was clearly inadequate and should not have been accepted by the chief at EPD. Ms. Williams said after the initial investigation, it was more thoroughly handled.

- **Relevant Department Policies and Practices**
  - **APM 1.4 Respectful Work Environment**

Mr. Denner said the issue could have gone to professional standards, and could have been an internal investigation. He said there were certainly points along way which showed unbecoming conduct. He said there was no clear standard with a timeline that outlined responsibility for that type of behavior. Mr. Denner guessed the City had boiler plate language from the State or an HR consultant that addressed the type of behavior in question, but that it probably was not specific enough, especially for law enforcement purposes. He acknowledged policing had been a male dominated profession, and was in the process of changing, but things still needed to be clarified.

Ms. Pitcher asked if Mr. Denner was suggesting that EPD should have its own more specific respectful workplace policy, or if the City should adopt something more thorough. Mr. Denner said the police commission and the police auditors' office should work through professional standards. He noted if the city failed to establish a timeline for reporting, then EPD should. Mr. Denner felt if the victim had been a represented employee, the union would have acted.

Ms. Williams said the respectful work environment policy was not followed. She agreed with the Auditor's office in that it was a violation all along. Ms. Williams noted while the Chief's first

adjudication said the case did not violate policy, she was relieved the Chief changed the initial adjudication. Ms. Williams was concerned about the seemingly systemic sexism in EPD.

Ms. Marek said specific policies tended to be more helpful; she noted the policy in question was broad, and talked about offensive and degrading remarks or conducts. Ms. Marek thought more specific guidance should exist.

Mr. Hargreaves said it was two-edged sword because if a policy was too specific, the department risked leaving things out and then having people say they did not violate policy. Mr. Gissiner said the PERS report focused on and had good recommendations for workforce harassment and prevention.

Mr. McIntire thought there was a policy issue, a practice issue and a cultural issue. First off, the behavior was inappropriate and he thought it would be offensive to any reasonable person. CRB had reviewed cases regarding misconduct before, and Mr. McIntire felt that culture was very important, but was often set by higher ups. He was troubled by the case and thought work and attention needed to be given to culture and practice. He did not know what there was to interpret in the policy, it seemed clear that Supervisor A's actions were inappropriate.

- **Policy and/or Training Considerations**

Mr. Hargreaves thought the case never should have gotten to CRB, and the city's HR should have done an adequate job. He did not know how CRB could affect functioning of city HR, but to him that was where the first big failure occurred; he thought the department didn't take the case very seriously. Mr. McIntire said if people do not know that the kind of behavior demonstrated in the allegation was unacceptable, the city needs to work on education and policies.

Mr. Denner said at the conclusion of the discussion, he wanted to present a motion to CRB.

Ms Williams recommended training on harassment. She was alarmed that the parties involved would have to continue to work together and concerned that the involved supervisor did not receive sufficient punishment.

Mr. Hargreaves agreed that paid leave, and then simply returning to the position the supervisor left, was not appropriate disposition.

Mr. Wig asked how often a supervisor the rank of Supervisor A would receive training on a respectful workplace environment. Mr. Gissiner said there was a city-wide training, but he was not sure it was mandatory. He thought it may be required early in hiring process. He was unsure if EPD had specific policies. Mr. Tinseth said those types of trainings were not usual occurrences for EPD. He said there was a diversity training and other types which sometimes touched on respect issues. Mr. Tinseth said in-service trainings were mandatory but not everyone was able to attend. Mr. Hargreaves said if the content was important there should be more than one training as an option.

Mr. Wig said he understood the respectful workplace environment policy involved more than the case discussed, but felt "respectful workplace environment" lumped issues together, when this case was sexual harassment. He wondered why there was not regular training on what was sexual harassment. Mr. Wig

said it was shocking that an employee who had been there for 10 years had never been to a sexual harassment training. His training recommendation was that employees attend trainings on sexual harassment.

Ms. Williams added that someone in a leadership positions should be familiar enough to teach a training on the issue.

Mr. McIntire was nervous to narrow the policy only to sexual harassment. He thought some improvements could be made on the policy, but there were lots of types of harassment. Ms. Marek said along that line, the policy should be focused on overall work climate. She noted many trainings focused on liability for the city, and covered what type of behaviors would potentially cause legal issues. Instead, trainings should be focused on how to improve work environments for everyone.

- **Adjudication Recommendations**

Ms. Williams agreed with the recommendations of the Auditor's Office. She did not agree with the first adjudication by the police chief, and she had major concerns regarding the credibility and honesty of Supervisor A's story.

Ms. Marek said Supervisor A's conduct was clearly in violation of policy, but she also felt the situation was more complicated. During interviews, she did not feel it was so clear that one party was being dishonest. There was an overlap between personal and professional relationships, and then the third party that came in later. Even with all taken into account, taking photos of someone's chest in the workplace constituted offensive conduct, and she agreed with the adjudication.

Mr. McIntire said he thought the case got overthought and overcomplicated when it was taken to credibility findings. He said it did not matter whether someone believed Supervisor A or B, the fact was both acknowledged a picture was taken, including Supervisor A. He was unsure why credibility was even discussed, because a policy was admittedly violated. Mr. McIntire was very disappointed in the weakness of the HR investigation and the first adjudication. Then, HR had an opportunity to change the adjudication after realizing additional information, but nothing changed. He agreed with the findings.

Mr. Denner concurred with the Police Auditor and the Chief's third adjudication. Mr. Denner added there were repeated photographs, not just one, and there was more than one message that Supervisor B didn't want to be photographed. He noted that the issue was not included in the adjudication. Mr. Denner said there was a blank disregard for that wish by Supervisor A. Unless a photo had workplace purpose, it had no purpose in environment.

Mr. Wig concurred with Police Auditor's recommendation.

Ms. Williams said as a CRB member, she had the impression there were many investigations where people involved were not telling the truth. She was concerned how HR dealt with Supervisor B and her complaint; after two years of investigation, the process seemed to fail. Ms. Williams had trouble understanding why he was back on duty, as the files made it clear there was violation.

Ms. Marek thought Supervisor A should be rehabilitated (along with the entire workplace culture) instead of being terminated, especially after so many years of service. While his actions were inappropriate, she didn't believe they met the threshold for termination.

Mr. Hargreaves said the discussion of discipline went beyond CRB. He too had difficulty seeing it as a firing offense, but also thought discipline of greater than 5-months paid leave was appropriate. Mr. McIntire concurred.

Mr. Gissiner said as a reminder, CRB members could not review employee discipline decisions. There was nothing about discipline in the case files provided.

Mr. Denner said discipline was out of CRB purview. He thought the interview with Ms. Pitcher had a telling phrase and he thought it would be remiss if it was not mentioned. The time lapse and the lack of attention given to the issues raised compounded the offense for both parties. Mr. Denner said lack of expedient decision making made the case more egregious than it was.

- **Additional Comments/Concerns**

Mr. Wig was bothered by the complex relationship dynamic. He felt Supervisor A brought up his out-of-work relationship with Supervisor B to excuse his conduct. Mr. Wig said it was clear the relationship between Supervisors A and B changed over three years; however, it was irrelevant whether Supervisor B would have been okay with the picture at one point in time, as the behavior was not work appropriate. Mr. Wig said during the investigation, it was alluded that the relationship changed over time, partly due to a rivalry between Supervisor B and another high-level supervisor. Supervisor A went so far as to say that the other high-level supervisor "poisoned the well" with Supervisor B. Mr. Wig said that was inappropriate to say about other leadership positions, because when inner-department conflict occurred, employees and the people they served suffered. Mr. Wig said that aspect of the case was not included at all in the Chief's report. He thought it was a failure of leadership that the situation persisted. Mr. Wig brought up a past case CRB reviewed involving two officers in a car at the University, when one said a racial slur about a group of civilians. Mr. Wig said the culture of the investigative process was such that the reporting officer trusted the case would be handled fairly, and implicitly trusted that other officers would not turn on him for filing a complaint. In that case, the reporting officer alleged the situation happened, and the violating officer denied the situation. The Chief wrote in his adjudication memo that the reporting party had no reason to lie, and the alleged perpetrator had no reason to tell the truth. Mr. Wig said this case was very similar, but he thought of two possible differences. First, the relationship between the Chief and Supervisor A had gotten to a point where the Chief could no longer be subjective. The second difference could be that Supervisor B was a woman. Mr. Wig did not know which was worse – losing perspective or blatant sexism. He noted none of that was on the record until mentioned at that night's meeting. Mr. Wig said Supervisor A was not accountable for actions, and he repeatedly tried to change the story to not be accountable for actions. If Supervisor A had said he was wrong and apologized, CRB would likely not be reviewing the case. Mr. Wig said to that day, the Chief had not held Supervisor A accountable for his actions.

Mr. Roseta said there were many documents with a significant redactions. He felt it would be hard to make a decision, with over a page of redactions in the case.

Mr. Gissiner said the redactions were references to other cases and other incidents. For example, there were past allegations or conducts included which were unrelated to the reviewed case; that was why parts were redacted. Mr. McIntire asked if the redactions were about Supervisor A. Mr. Gissiner said more so the complainant but during the course of interviews, other incidents were discussed that were not related in a conduct way. Mr. Roseta said both the memo from HR and from the attorney were labeled confidential, but if there were other items that could affect credibility they should be available to people on board, rather than have them eliminated. Ms. Marek asked whether it was required the content was removed. Ms. Pitcher said CRB could legally review closed cases; the case that evening was closed, but some parts discussed during the case were not closed or never investigated. It was largely a records issue around personnel files.

Mr. Denner said the path for providing feedback to the city was typically through the auditor and the supervisor of internal affairs. He thought that likely meant HR would not see CRB deliberations. Mr. Denner said the concept of CRB was to shed light on issues that arise around police conduct. He felt this case crossed into the HR area and performance in that department. He thought it needed to be made clear to somebody. Ms. Williams asked exactly which part of the discussion. Mr. Denner said the minutes of the entire discussion, not the case file. Mr. Hargreaves agreed with Mr. Denner and said he didn't know how else to reach out to HR. He thought there was a consensus concern over how the HR department handled the matter, and felt CRB should say so directly to HR. Mr. Roseta said good idea to send to both entities, however, did not think CRB should add any type of value statement. Mr. Denner asked CRB to send the minutes to HR and other relevant departments.

**MOTION:** Mr. Denner, seconded by Mr. Hargreaves, moved to send the minutes on the discussion regarding a respectful workplace to the City Manager, the Human Resources Department, and to Central Services. The motion carried, unanimously.

Mr. Wig asked CRB to vote on whether to review part two of the case at the next meeting. Mr. Gissiner said part two of the case was closed, and additional information regarding Supervisor A had come to light. Ms. Pitcher mentioned that CRB usually only met in December or January, so CRB could choose one month. CRB chose to meet in January and review part two of the case at that time.

**MOTION:** Mr. Hargreaves, seconded by Ms. Williams, moved to review part two of the case discussed that evening at the January 2018 meeting. The motion carried, unanimously.

## **7. BREAK**

CRB took a break from 6:48 p.m. until 6:58 p.m.

## **8. TRAINING TOPIC: OBJECTIVES AND CHALLENGES OF IMPLEMENTATION OF CIVILIAN OVERSIGHT**

Mr. Wig introduced that evening's panel. He noted the initial idea for the panel was from a story on creating an independent office of the police auditor and the civilian review board. Mr. Wig said in that instance, many women of color gathered together to address grievances and it was an inspiring story. Mr. Wig said one of the primary challenges to implementation of civilian oversight was race. He said, for example, the Police Chief, the Police Auditor and Junior Auditor, the Mayor, and 7 out of 8 city councilors were white. Mr. Wig said communities of color and other historically marginalized communities, such as Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Queer, and Transgender (LGBTQ), experience policing in a very different way, and it could be argued they experience police misconduct at a disproportionate rate.

Mr. Wig said CRB needed diversity and perspectives that they did not have much access to, despite fact that the Police Auditor's office went above and beyond to try and reach out to people in other communities. Phil Carrasco, Director of Grupo Latino de Acción Directa (GLAD), was there to speak about issues important to the community.

Mr. Carrasco said GLAD of Lane County worried about public safety, food insecurity, environmental justice, and other pressing social issues; however, being part of a more vulnerable community, police misconduct and policies were very important and came to the forefront sometimes. Mr. Carrasco said for the past couple years, GLAD held public forums with members of the Latino community, meaning not representatives of the community, but full members. In addition, many public officials have come and engaged with GLAD. He said discussion usually rose to the level of customs and immigration, and has often informed policies GLAD brought forward to City Council, such as sanctuary ordinances. He said GLAD strove for an inclusive community that listens to citizen concerns. Mr. Carrasco said he went to a number of commissions, committees, and boards in Eugene, and the demographic was generally white and middle-class; what had become unacceptable was when someone Hispanic came to a meeting, and the commission asked how to get more color and diversity on the board." Mr. Carrasco said it often meant letting someone else apply. He added it was an issue that needed to continue and be talked. He was part of The Human Rights Commission for some time, and he said they struggled with diversity there, but tried to make itself very representative.

Mr. Wig said CRB was concerned about professional police stops, which fell under the broader category of racial profiling. He asked if there was a perception in GLAD or the Latino community that people were being profiled. He wondered if people were concerned about law enforcement. Mr. Carrasco said it was always something they were concerned about, especially when there were rumors mixed with real stories about bad actors in EPD. Everyone becomes concerned, and it becomes what everyone is going to expect. He said it was helpful that the sheriff's department, as well as EPD and Springfield Police Department, expressed what they would or wouldn't do during a police stop, and why. Mr. Carrasco said it was important for police to not enforce immigration type policies – it was not their duty, and there were already not enough police officers in the state. Those responsibilities were solely immigration. Mr. Carrasco said it was helpful to have Ms. Hernandez and others in the city to refer to Spanish speakers, so they could report whatever they were experiencing. Mr. Carrasco said during the last forums he saw a decrease in distrust of the police department; he felt they need to continually have conversations with the community, and have a face to the department. It was important they expressed how police would do a professionally police stop, that way people know what that looks like, and what their rights were if something was going wrong.

Mr. Wig asked how well known the Police Auditor's office was in the community, and if it was known, was it trusted.

Mr. Carrasco said no organization can be helpful to the community they intend to serve if there was no real trust. He said when the office was coupled with other activists and leaders in the Latino community, such as Alex Reina, a local media outlet, it was more successful. Mr. Reina had been instrumental in explaining what the Auditor's office does, and he had quite substantial views from the Latino community. Mr. Carrasco said there would never be total trust, as police officers have a gun, a baton, a Taser, and defensive skills. More importantly, police had protection and it was hard to build trust if people didn't talk about it. Mr. Carrasco thought different types of civilian review boards should be discussed; some had subpoena power to investigate disciplinary actions. Mr. Casco asked if CRB received some type of reports.

Ms. Pitcher said CRB received the weekly, monthly, and annual reports created by the Auditor's Office. Mr. Gissiner said he feared the Latino community underreported safety issues because of the recent emphasis from the federal government toward immigration. He wondered about Mr. Carrasco perspective. Mr. Carrasco said crime is underreported, and 40% of the Latino population will not report, while 70% of undocumented folks would not report. He said it was easy to target the administration because of the climate they created, but Mr. Carrasco reiterated that dialogue be maintained by the police auditor and the police chief. For example, recordings at forums to ensure accountability were valuable tools

Mr. McIntire asked what Mr. Carrasco meant when he said "making room" on committees for others. He was certainly willing to make room for anyone wanting to serve. He noted CRB tried to reach out and recruit different groups in the community. Mr. McIntire was curious if the Latino community had interest. Mr. Carrasco explained distrust eroded how efficient a CRB could be, if a Latino person felt they would not have any real power. Mr. Carrasco said certain demographics fit this type of service more, such as people who were retired or who had jobs that allowed more flexibility. He said the average median income between the Latino population and the broader white population – he thought it was the job of every board to advertise what board was doing so people knew about it. Mr. Wig said the Auditor's Office had held forums in the past, but there were things individual board members could do to help to put themselves out there more.

Mr. Carrasco made a point that the most culturally competent or responsive organizations were for-profit because want to sell people something. For-profit companies had culturally appropriate settings, and also in Spanish to encourage participation. He wondered how many normally-engaged citizens understood role of CRB. He said if the city or its committees wanted involvement, they needed to sell themselves to the community to encourage civic engagement.

Mr. Gissiner asked if the addition of a stipend would attract more people who needed money for babysitting or transportation. He said stipends were not offered for any committees, which made participation heavily weighted to the South Hills area and the people with the most means. Mr. Carrasco said he thought it would make a difference, but said it still needed to be advertised to ensure people could take advantage of the opportunity. He said it was most valuable to go directly to the community, not do what is typical and go to the library and wait for people to come.

Ms. Pitcher said they do a lot of outreach, and had an upcoming recruitment period for CRB. She asked Ms. Hernandez if CRB could include that in the upcoming forum. Ms. Hernandez responded that it would be great to have a quick announcement about open positions.

Ms. Williams asked if CRB would have the means to get a translator for a solely Spanish-speaker. Mr. Gissiner said yes.

Mr. Carrasco concluded with two thoughts. He said it was the community's responsibility to make every one of our departments needs to be a shining example, especially since Eugene was a human rights city. He said the case reviewed that evening was not an example of the America the community wanted to be. Second, he was curious what the percentage of complaints filed were actually reviewed. Mr. Gissiner said about 1/3 of cases that are classified as allegations. He explained his office sees many of service complaints. Ms. Pitcher said CRB saw every complaint through open and closed case reports, but CRB did a closer review of about 25 to 30 allegations and 6 service complaints per year. The Auditor's Office received about 350 complaints a year. Mr. Wig said when CRB reviewed service cases, the chair and vice-chair tried to pick cases representative of the greater trends.

Mr. Carrasco asked if CRB included settlement cases in reports, and how much money was doled out in settlement cases. He thought it would be interesting to see that number; it would also add a reason to why CRB exists, and show why it was important to always improve the Auditor's Office. In addition, he had thought about the military equipment that EPD had access to. Mr. Carrasco wondered how many times the military equipment was deployed, versus how many service calls were received. He thought it was important to keep track of usage for the public, as many people don't feel that kind of equipment is necessary.

Ms. Pitcher said that whenever tactical vehicles were used, it was policy to report the use. Mr. Gissiner said the perception of use was probably greater than reality. Mr. Wig said if someone was from a community targeted by immigration, the equipment could be a serious concern for them.

Mr. Denner said subpoena power was a huge issue in front of the police commission around ten years ago. They were going to recommend it to city council for adoption. He didn't remember the whole discussion, but the turning point was that if a standard for the committee was set so high that members had subpoena power, members had to be trained so the task was done correctly. Mr. Denner noted some communities give the auditor or ombudsman subpoena power, but very few gave CRB subpoena power. He added those were usually federally mandated.

Mr. Gissiner said city council had subpoena power, and as an agent of city council. The police auditor had access to all police records, and officers were required to provide testimony during investigations. He said in other places where CRBs have subpoena power, it was usually because the chief or union had successfully structured the system to where officers did not have to give testimony. Mr. Gissiner said certainly, Oregon was hindered by the Public Records Law being protective regarding public employee records. He thought it was more beneficial to share everything with the community. For example, in Ohio, CRB could speak subjects' names and everything that was in the case file, rather than telling the public to

trust CRB. He said it was great for employees, but not great for transparency. Because of Public Records Law, people within the department don't know what actually happened in the case.

Mr. Denner said EPD was a good place, and wanted to ensure that evening's case was not an indictment of the entire department. He thought the world of most of the employees and the department.

Mr. Carrasco said if EPD was honest about protecting and serving, they would do the work necessary to ensure the community trusts them, and that included internal behavior. Mr. Carrasco said it was not an indictment of the entire department, but the result of the case discussion is an indictment of how it was structured. Mr. Carrasco said Supervisor A was in the office again, and that was the person he was asking his community to trust.

Mr. Wig said while Supervisor A's behavior wasn't typical of all EPD, the PERF report said culture was the hardest thing to change but most important. Mr. Gissiner said the United States had 5% of world population but 25% prison population – most of which are people of color. He said the value of CRB was trust, but it needed people more representative of the entire Eugene community. Mr. Gissiner said there were people in CRB who were lawyers and judges, and CRB needed to break down barriers of intimidation and encourage participation from more residents with an everyday perspective.

Ms. Williams noted there was an organization that paid for babysitting so community members could participate in public committees.

#### **9. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT UPDATE: PUBLIC SAFETY FORUM**

Ms. Hernandez provided an update on the Public Safety Forum scheduled for Wednesday, December 6<sup>th</sup> from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. at El Rio de Camino. Alex Reyna would be live streaming the event so people could engage from home. She said a web link was sent to CRB, and there was a Facebook page. Ms. Hernandez said it was more than a forum at that point. She had talked to the school said it was turning into an awareness event. She explained the first hour would be tabling for local nonprofits, and a Tio Pepe restaurant would provide food. The second hour would be guided by Mr. Reyna, and city departments would talk to the audience about what they do and answer any questions. Additionally, people could submit questions online via the Facebook live feed, or an anonymous box on site. Ms. Hernandez said the purpose of the forum was to build a sense of trust in the city government.

Mr. Gissiner said it would be a place for people to ask general safety questions, like what to do with a broken car window, or a grease fire on the stove for example. He said it was not a showcase for agencies, it would be a safe place for people to ask questions about things going on in their lives. Many people don't know what to do in certain emergency situations, and if someone was from another country it could be concerning. Mr. Gissiner said the Police Auditor's office wanted to help build trust. Mr. Gissiner said the event would be entirely in Spanish. He hoped it would be festive and informative, and wanted people to feel comfortable.

Ms. Hernandez noted an email regarding training topics was sent to CRB members and asked for suggestions.

#### **10. AUDITOR REPORT**

Mr. Gissiner said he agreed with portions of the PERF report. He thought some methodology was flawed, such as comparing Eugene's retention rate to other rates in different cities across the country. For example, Cincinnati had 40 suburbs that officers could transfer between and Eugene doesn't - they were very different places. Mr. Gissiner said Los Angeles County gave a presentation on how they recruited millennials using cellphones. Mr. Gissiner was pleased to see how PERF talked about people with Acting in Charge (AIC) status, because he thought people were in those positions for too long, and he was unsure if it was an HR issue or a police department issue. He felt AIC should be a maximum of 90 days. When in an AIC position, the person was hanging by thread and if they made a mistake, it gave reason deny the permanent position. Mr. Gissiner wanted to see more diversity in the police department, and have officers with a wide range of backgrounds including social services. The width of recruitment outlined in the PERF was not where he wanted it to be. He did not want departments to be overly dependent on pre-hire testing. Mr. Gissiner said all the issues he shared were important to him, and he shared his thoughts with PERF too.

Mr. Gissiner reported he met with the consultant for about four hours regarding the new chief hiring process. He said the consultant published the brochure, which would hopefully bring some attention.

Mr. Gissiner said EPD had some service issues. For example, no one was at a reporting call to clear the house after a burglary, so the residents were there for 7 hours alone. Mr. Gissiner appreciated the feeling that if the bad guy wasn't there then it was a cold call, but the fear factor affected the residents. Mr. Gissiner wondered if there was a prioritizing of ticketing people with open containers that same evening.

Mr. Gissiner said in the PERF report, it was highlighted there was historically few performance evaluations.

Mr. Wig asked if internal performance reviews could be a future training topic. Mr. McIntire said the police commission had that training. He knew in the strategic plan there was an area dedicated to performance reviews.

Mr. Denner asked about a call to Coburg Road. He said he would like to see that case on the CRB agenda if it had been investigated. Mr. Gissiner said the case involved nonsworn personnel and CRB didn't have jurisdiction to review those cases.

## **10. ADJOURN**

Mr. Wig adjourned the CRB meeting at 8:01 p.m.

*(Recorded by Marina Brassfield, LCOG)*

## Eugene Police Department

### November 2017 Open Case Report

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Nov 1, 2017  
Class/sub-class: Inquiry  
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

A woman approached an officer concerned that at a football game a man came in contact with her. The incident was witnessed by the officer. The officer indicated that he thought that the man had stumbled, accidentally falling into her with no criminal intent. The officer and the woman had a cordial conversation about the event and she seemed satisfied with the explanation.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Nov 2, 2017  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance  
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP contacted the Auditor's Office with a concern about a how a traffic accident in which his wife, a pedestrian, was handled. RP felt the call was handled poorly, by both fire and police. His wife was hit by a car, and no one accessed rather she could walk or not, she was treated dismissively, not asked if she wanted to press charges, no report was taken, nor was the driver cited. No ambulance was called because fire decide she was fine, but at the hospital she was diagnosed as concussed.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: Nov 3, 2017  
Class/sub-class: Policy Complaint  
Disposition:

RP reported an incident in which an officer told her she could not be a witness in an incident that happened with her boyfriend at a laundromat. She was told something about it not holding up in court. RP claims this is the third or fourth time she has been told this, and she doesn't understand why officers will not take her account of incidents.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Nov 3, 2017  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance  
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP filed a complaint form asking EPD to inform the officer who cited her for reckless driving that the information he provided her about being able to take a driver's education course and have the citation expelled was not accurate. Her citation was not eligible for that program.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Nov 5, 2017  
Class/sub-class: Inquiry  
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

Officers were sent Code 3 to a shots fired call. Upon arriving officers determined there were no shots fired, nor was there a firearm involved in the incident. The car was in a dispute over a parking spot in

the parking lot and there was an assault involving two males related to the two involved vehicles. The RP said she wished the officer would have taken the time to listen to her.

---

Incident type: Incident Review  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Nov 6, 2017  
Class/sub-class: Incident Review / Use of Force  
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

A person reported concerns about the method officer used to detain a juvenile who was acting violent and threatening.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: Nov 6, 2017  
Class/sub-class: Inquiry  
Disposition:

RP contacted the Auditor's Office with a concern about his son being stopped twice in the last two months by EPD officers while walking home from School.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Nov 7, 2017  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Service level  
Disposition: Dismissed-Other

RP contacted the Auditor's Office upset that when she tried to get an employee at the downtown station to review a security video, in which she was accused of wrongly shoplifting, they would not look at the video. RP was not cited or talked to by police.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Nov 7, 2017  
Class/sub-class: Policy Complaint  
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP was upset at an EPD vehicle speeding down Barger at an unsafe speed. RP feels that even though the officer's lights and sirens were activated it was too fast for a school and fire department zone. RP also noted that this happens frequently on Barger in front of his home.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Nov 8, 2017  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance  
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP reported an incident in which an elderly driver hit the side of his mirror as they were merging from 2 lanes to one. An officer was driving in front of RP when it occurred. The officer stopped his vehicle in the middle of the lane in front of him, no emergency lights, told him he needed to calm down and then lied to his face, telling him the situation was his fault. RP wants the officer reported for lying and impeding traffic.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Nov 8, 2017  
Class/sub-class: Inquiry

Disposition: Dismissed-o/s jurisdic.

RP filed a complaint that no one would take a report about her being kidnapped and implanted with a medical communication antenna. RP lists an Officer, but an Incident address as the Springfield Police Station.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: Nov 11, 2017  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance  
Disposition:

RP reported being given incorrect information from a call taker when trying to report a hit and run that significantly damaged his vehicle.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: Nov 13, 2017  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance  
Disposition:

RP contacted the Auditor's Office with a concern that he was not taken seriously when he reported an assault by 4 foreign students. RP had went to speak with a friend about a misunderstanding they were having and instead was assaulted by the 4 men. RP wants to press charges, but after reviewing the police report he finds it is saying the incident was unfounded.

---

Incident type: Incident Review  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Nov 15, 2017  
Class/sub-class: Incident Review / Performance  
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP filed a complaint form alleging that an officer did not follow EPD procedures by not double locking his hand cuffs causing nerve damage, that he jumped to wrong conclusions because of a patch on his jacket, that he lied to justify pulling his weapon, that the officer did not have body cam turned on, and that he slammed his hand in to the car door when removing him from the vehicle at the jail.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: Nov 17, 2017  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance  
Disposition:

RP was concerned that the noise complaint he called in morphed into just a guy sitting in his truck when the officer finally showed up. RP called into dispatch a guy running his loud truck for 3 hours at 1 am and then again at 7:30 am. When he called the officer back about what was going on, as he needed the information to file a complaint with the Housing Authority, he was told I can't really tell you anything, and was directed to call the Auditor's Office.

---

Incident type: Incident Review  
Status: Active  
Received date: Nov 22, 2017  
Class/sub-class: Incident Review / Conduct  
Disposition:

RP contacted the Auditor's Office with a concern that in 2014 she was frisked by an officer during a bike stop and then arrested for a warrant. RP claimed that she was frisked by a male officer instead of a female. RP also mentioned that a week later she was arrested on an assault of her ex-boyfriend and

he wasn't investigated for beating her up leading her to believe the police were targeting her.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: Nov 25, 2017  
Class/sub-class: Inquiry  
Disposition:

RP filed a complaint alleging that when officers were called because she was disorderly they forced her into the police car, not allowing EMT's to look at her supposedly because she was too aggressive. They also threw a mask over her head. RP goes on to tell of treatment at the jail which included being tased and piled on.

---

Incident type: Incident Review  
Status: Active  
Received date: Nov 25, 2017  
Class/sub-class: Incident Review / Performance  
Disposition:

An employee at a store called to advise they needed Cahoots for a person in "crisis". That they had been locked in the bathroom for an hour, but the bathroom door was now open. There were at least 20 calls holding, of which 4 were Cahoots calls. Cahoots was on an additional call. Within 40 minutes the employee called back to advise the patient was not breathing or conscious and an off duty Cahoots employee was on scene doing CPR.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: Nov 27, 2017  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance  
Disposition:

RP, a disabled veteran reported an officer who responded to his call for service about a vehicle in front of his home which continues to park the wrong way on the street, today it was parked 18 inches away from the curb and facing the wrong way, the officer decided it wasn't a hazard and rudely told RP that she had more important calls to deal with.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: Nov 27, 2017  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance  
Disposition:

RP reported an EPD SUV driving without headlights on. RP felt this was dangerous. RP does not need a call back.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Nov 28, 2017  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance  
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP called dispatch upset that his trespass call had held, that the officer didn't take the suspect's photo, and that the poor service he received is bias related. He wanted to speak to a police supervisor.

Handled, dismissed per Auditor.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: Nov 29, 2017  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Service level  
Disposition:

RP called EPD to file a theft report for an item he sold on E-Bay that was not returned to him after the buyer claimed it was not working. RP called the non-emergency number on Sunday and was given a case number, and told someone would call him. He received a call from what he thought was a detective who told him after talking to supervisor that they could not take a report for theft as it was a civil issue. RP doesn't get how theft which a crime is a civil issue. He has 10 days to get a report filed with E-Bay and feels EPD is not willing to go through the motions to help a citizen, EPD has just failed him.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: Nov 29, 2017  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Service level  
Disposition:

RP contacted the Auditor's Office upset that he cannot get Animal Control to do anything about a neighbor's barking dog, except give a warning. He has called at least 3 times in the past year but had given up until today when the dog barked continuously from 8:30am until he called right before 1pm with it still barking because he has workers in this yard. He was told they were on another call and would try and get to it, but would need to hear the dog. RP wants Animal Control to solve the problem, not just warn the neighbor, as that has not helped.

---

Incident type: Auditor Intake  
Status: Active  
Received date: Nov 30, 2017  
Class/sub-class: Incident Review / Conduct  
Disposition:

RP contacted the Auditor's Office about an incident in which he was denied access to his grandson at University District Hospital by an EPD officer even though he was able to provide the Power of Attorney he holds over his grandson's medical care and any and all rights that a natural parent has.

## Eugene Police Department

### November 2017 Closed Case Report

---

Incident type: IA Investigation

Status: Completed

Received date: Mar 21, 2017

Class/sub-class: Allegation of Misconduct / Performance

Disposition: Within Policy

Internal allegation alleging that a canine was physically mishandled by a canine handler.

1101.1.B.9 Unsatisfactory Performance - It is alleged that an officer's actions toward his assigned canine was abusive during a call for service.

Letter from DA; no crime.

Allegations:

Performance - 1101.1.B.9 Unsatisfactory Performance - Within Policy

## Eugene Police Department

### December 2017 Open Case Report

---

Incident type: Incident Review  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Nov 25, 2017  
Occurred date: Nov 25, 2017  
Class/sub-class: Incident Review / Performance  
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

AN employee of a coffee shop called to advise they needed Cahoots for a person in "crisis". That they had been locked in the bathroom for an hour, but the bathroom door was now open. There were at least 20 calls holding, of which 4 were Cahoots calls. Cahoots was on an additional call. Within 40 minutes the employee called back to advise the patient was not breathing or conscious and an off duty Cahoots employee was on scene doing CPR.

---

Incident type: Incident Review  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Nov 30, 2017  
Occurred date: Nov 19, 2017  
Class/sub-class: Incident Review / Conduct  
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP contacted the Auditor's Office about an incident in which he was denied access to his grandson at the hospital by an EPD officer even though he was able to provide the Power of Attorney he holds over his grandson's medical care and any and all rights that a natural parent has. RP's grandson had been taken to the hospital for swallowing some sort of pill while in the care of the child's father. The officer told him that the father was in their custody for a heroin charge and that she did not know where the child was. RP stated that he should have been taken to the child and the child released to him after any emergency room care, instead the child was turned over to DHS and is now in Foster Care.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Dec 1, 2017  
Occurred date: Oct 12, 2017  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance  
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP contacted the Auditor's Office concerned that she has been unable to get a return call about a case in which her daughter's car was stolen. The car was recovered with a lot of damage and all her daughter's belongings missing. The RP stated that it had been difficult to get newly discovered information to EPD. RP stated that she has called several times with call takers saying the officer will call her back, she has never been transferred to his voicemail or line and has never received a call back.

---

Incident type: Incident Review  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Dec 2, 2017  
Occurred date: Dec 2, 2017  
Class/sub-class: Incident Review / Performance  
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

Central Lane 911 received a call from a woman regarding an unattended child in a vehicle at a store. The caller advised a 5 year old child was alone in the car with the engine running and no adults for 10 minutes. The caller later advised a female and two other children had left the area. A supervisor received information that the vehicle was registered to an EPD employee. Normal protocol was to dispatch officers to the registered address for a welfare check on the child. The supervisor responded to the residence for a welfare check, re-contacted the complainant, and advised his chain of command and IA. The supervisor learned that the child in question was nearly 10 years old and the welfare check revealed that the child was being well cared for; in addition, the supervisor learned that the involved employee was not in the area and that this incident had involved the employee's spouse. It did not appear that the child had been left in a situation that would endanger the health or welfare of the child. The supervisor entered the incident in BlueTeam as a record, though it turned out to not involve any employees of EPD. The supervisor recommended, and our office concurred, that this be closed at intake.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Dec 8, 2017  
Occurred date: Dec 8, 2017  
Class/sub-class: Inquiry /  
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

An officer was arresting a woman for Assault IV APA. Once she was in custody she asked him if she was being arrested due to her race.

A supervisor spoke with the RP who advised that she asked it due to previous encounters with the Roseburg Police Department.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Dec 8, 2017  
Occurred date: Dec 8, 2017  
Class/sub-class: Inquiry /  
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

The complainant on a call was found by two officers to have initiated a false report. He had been admonished several times about not making a false report before he was taken into custody. Once in custody, the RP stated that he was only being arrested due to his race.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: Dec 8, 2017  
Occurred date: Dec 2, 2017  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance  
Disposition:

The RP contacted the Auditor's Office concerned that when she reported her friend missing, it resulted in an investigation from Senior and Disabled Services. The RP felt that the investigation was only because the involved employee misrepresented her as a caregiver when in fact she was just a friend.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: Dec 11, 2017  
Occurred date: Dec 2, 2017  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance  
Disposition:

The RP contacted the Auditor's Office related to an incident in which she was assaulted. She stated that the officer who responded was very helpful and nice and listed several criminal charges that would be lodged, but a week later the DA's office did not have a report and the records department informed her that they have a report but no charges listed. RP stated that she had gotten a Protective Order but is anxious to have the DA get the criminal charges she was told about. The RP stated that the officer's phone line rings busy and she has been unable to get in touch with him to find out what happened with the charges.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Dec 11, 2017  
Occurred date: Nov 29, 2017  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance  
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP commented on social media that he saw two different officers in patrol cars texting, neither vehicle had their headlights on, and RP was unable to get their attention as they were so engrossed in their phones.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Dec 11, 2017  
Occurred date: Nov 14, 2017  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance  
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP stopped by with a concern about EPD officers who have come to his apartment late in the evening (2100 to 0100) to talk with him about some text messages. RP does not open the door at this time because of his apartment's quiet hours and has told officers to comeback in the daytime for such a trivial matter. RP complained that the officers banged loudly on his door and shone their flashlights into his window. RP also suspected officers had removed stickers from his door.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Dec 11, 2017  
Occurred date: Dec 10, 2017  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Courtesy  
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP contacted the Auditor's Office with a concern about the tone an officer took with his wife who was in a traffic accident in which her air bag deployed. RP's wife was disoriented and couldn't find her insurance card. The officer's response was "If you don't give me your insurance right now, I'm going to cite you." He then made her call her insurance to get a policy number. RP stated that his wife was seriously injured in the accident.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: Dec 13, 2017  
Occurred date: Jul 6, 2017  
Class/sub-class: Inquiry /  
Disposition:

RP called to inquire whether the officers involved in the arrest and use of force on her son had received CIT training. The incident occurred in July, but RP had just received the police report.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Dec 14, 2017  
Occurred date: Dec 14, 2017  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance  
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP stopped by the Auditor's Office to report that when he called the non-emergency line to ask for an officer to take a report on a man who has been menacing him, and he had just found out his identity, the call taker told him she would not send an officer.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: Dec 14, 2017  
Occurred date: Sep 28, 2017  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance  
Disposition:

RP stopped by the Auditor's office with a concern that a report he made to an officer about his vehicle being stolen by a man who he had allowed to live on his property was not being looked into and was being considered a civil issue. RP is elderly with Parkinson's and he believes that the officer did not totally understand the issue, as a couple of his other cars were involved in the story. RP has been unable to get in touch with the officer to clarify the issue.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Dec 16, 2017  
Occurred date: Dec 14, 2017  
Class/sub-class: Policy Complaint /  
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP filed a complaint upset that officers failed to take a police report and cite a driver who was at fault in an injury accident in which she was involved. RP was told it was the officer's discretion and it was policy unless there was serious physical injury. RP was transported to the hospital and can't understand such a policy.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: Dec 19, 2017  
Occurred date:  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance  
Disposition:

RP contacted the Auditor's Office requesting to speak with the supervisor that is in charge of EPD officers and the firing range. RP is concerned about the high rate of speed that officers are traveling on the road on their way to the range.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: Dec 19, 2017  
Occurred date: Dec 12, 2017  
Class/sub-class: Inquiry /  
Disposition:

RP contacted the Auditor's Office with a concern that EPD will not conduct a welfare check on her daughter who is a college student in town. RP believes that her daughter's boyfriend is sex trafficking and physically abusing her. RP contacted EPD for a welfare check, 2 days later when she called back she was told it had been assigned to a detective who was out of town. She also spoke with a supervisor who refused to send anyone to look into the issue.

---

Incident type: Incident Review  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Dec 23, 2017  
Occurred date: Dec 23, 2017  
Class/sub-class: Incident Review / Use of Force  
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

A supervisor was contacted by an officer who had arrested a DUII driver. The driver was claiming that the employee had punched him in the face as he was putting him in the back of a car; the officer denied striking the RP or using any reportable force. The supervisor reviewed body-worn camera footage of the interaction and spoke with the involved employee. The video showed that the employee did not strike the RP. In addition, medics were called (who cleared the RP). The supervisor attempted to talk to the RP and observed no physical injuries.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: Dec 26, 2017  
Occurred date: Nov 30, 2017  
Class/sub-class: Inquiry /  
Disposition:

RP called dispatch concerned about the way a search warrant was executed at her house. RP stated that she had attempted to reach an employee numerous times and was told he was on vacation. RP stated that her safe had been seized and that had her medicine inside and it hasn't been returned. She told me she was out of state on the East Coast when the search warrant was executed. RP also stated that numerous items of value were broken during the warrant execution and evidence wasn't lodged between the time officers left her house, Friday morning, and the following Monday.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: Dec 28, 2017  
Occurred date: Jul 5, 2017  
Class/sub-class: Inquiry /  
Disposition:

RP stated he has been arrested several times since July 2017. He stated that in July 2017, could not remember the date, he was arrested by EPD and the officer injured his shoulder to the extent that he is scheduled for surgery. He also stated that the handcuffs were applied too tightly.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: Dec 28, 2017  
Occurred date: Dec 28, 2017  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Courtesy  
Disposition:

RP stated that while he was looking at the wreath at the police substation a woman came out and accused him of placing a plastic gun on the wreath. Then an officer came out and started to yell at him to leave Eugene and never come back. The officer continued to yell at him as he walked away.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: Dec 28, 2017  
Occurred date: Dec 26, 2017  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance  
Disposition:

RP posted to social media that an EPD vehicle had not stopped for her and her dogs at a crosswalk.

## Police Auditor's Office

### Closed Case Report

---

#### IA Investigation

**Received:** Sep 11, 2017  
**Occurred:** Sep 08, 2017  
**Opened:** Sep 13, 2017  
**Assigned:** Sep 13, 2017  
**Due:** Nov 13, 2017

**Status:** Completed Dec 11, 2017 Disposition - Sustained

#### Incident summary:

RP reported an incident in which an off duty EPD Officer approached the vehicle in which he, his girlfriend and her mother were driving, pounding on the window, shouting and cursing that they cut him off and he was an Eugene cop. RP got out of the car and stated that the EPD employee yelled in his face. RP then called the police and alleged that the employee struck him with his vehicle as he left the scene.

1101.1.B.25 Unbecoming Conduct - It is alleged that the EPD employee was involved in an off duty incident wherein he identified himself as a Eugene Police Officer and conducted himself in a manner that reflected negatively on the Eugene Police Department and brought discredit upon himself and the Eugene Police Department.

---

#### Supervisor Action

**Received:** Oct 15, 2017  
**Occurred:**  
**Opened:** Oct 16, 2017  
**Assigned:** Oct 17, 2017  
**Due:** Dec 09, 2017

**Status:** Completed Dec 08, 2017 Disposition - Supervisor Review-Closed

#### Incident summary:

RP reported an incident in which she had made a report to EPD concerning fraud, id theft and other issues in a different jurisdiction. RP called the other jurisdiction at the officer's suggestion and then called him back with their reply, leaving a message. A few days later she received a call from his superior demanding she not call the officer. RP found it upsetting that EPD is unwilling to assist her in any way.

---

#### Supervisor Action

**Received:** Nov 03, 2017  
**Occurred:** Nov 01, 2017  
**Opened:** Nov 13, 2017  
**Assigned:** Nov 14, 2017  
**Due:** Dec 13, 2017

**Status:** Completed Dec 13, 2017 Disposition - Supervisor Review-Closed

#### Incident summary:

RP report an incident in which an officer told her she could not be a witness in an incident that happened with her boyfriend at a laundromat. She was told something about it not holding up in court. RP claims this is the third or fourth time she has been told this, and she doesn't understand why officers will not take her account of incidents.

---

#### Supervisor Action

**Received:** Nov 08, 2017  
**Occurred:** Nov 07, 2017  
**Opened:** Nov 13, 2017  
**Assigned:** Nov 14, 2017  
**Due:** Dec 13, 2017

**Status:** Completed Dec 01, 2017 Disposition - Supervisor Review-Closed

#### Incident summary:

RP reported an incident in which an elderly driver hit the side of his mirror as they were merging from 2 lanes to one. An officer was driving in front of RP when it occurred. RP stated that the officer stopped his vehicle in the middle of the lane in front of him without activating his emergency lights and told him he needed to calm down and that the situation was his fault.

---

#### Supervisor Action

**Received:** Nov 11, 2017  
**Occurred:** Nov 10, 2017  
**Opened:** Nov 14, 2017  
**Assigned:** Nov 14, 2017  
**Due:** Dec 14, 2017

**Status:** Completed Dec 22, 2017 Disposition - Supervisor Review-Closed

#### Incident summary:

RP reported being given incorrect information from a calltaker when trying to report a hit and run that significantly damaged his vehicle

---

#### Supervisor Action

**Received:** Nov 13, 2017  
**Occurred:** Nov 08, 2017  
**Opened:** Nov 14, 2017  
**Assigned:** Nov 14, 2017  
**Due:** Dec 26, 2017

**Status:** Completed Dec 28, 2017 Disposition - Supervisor Review-Closed

#### Incident summary:

RP contacted the Auditor's Office with a concern that he was not taken seriously when he reported an assault by 4 Middle Eastern students. RP wanted to press charges, but reviewed the police report and was upset that it stated the incident was unfounded.

---

#### Incident Review

**Received:** Nov 15, 2017  
**Occurred:** Oct 17, 2017

**Opened:** Nov 17, 2017  
**Assigned:** Nov 22, 2017  
**Due:** Dec 17, 2017

**Status:** Completed Dec 01, 2017 Disposition - Supervisor Review-Closed

**Incident summary:**

RP filed a complaint form alleging that an officer did not follow EPD procedures by not double locking his hand cuffs causing nerve damage, that the employee jumped to conclusions because of a patch on his jacket, that the employee lied to justify pulling his weapon, that the employee did not have body cam turned on, and that he slammed his hand in to the car door when removing him from the vehicle at the jail.

---

**Supervisor Action**

**Received:** Nov 17, 2017  
**Occurred:** Nov 16, 2017  
**Opened:** Nov 20, 2017  
**Assigned:** Nov 20, 2017  
**Due:** Dec 20, 2017

**Status:** Completed Dec 21, 2017 Disposition - Supervisor Review-Closed

**Incident summary:**

RP was concerned about how his noise complaint was handled. RP stated that he called to complain about someone running his loud truck for 3 hours, but that the officer who finally showed up thought the complaint was just about someone sitting in a truck

---

**Supervisor Action**

**Received:** Nov 25, 2017  
**Occurred:** Oct 16, 2017  
**Opened:** Nov 28, 2017  
**Assigned:** Nov 28, 2017  
**Due:** Dec 28, 2017

**Status:** Completed Dec 20, 2017 Disposition - Supervisor Review-Closed

**Incident summary:**

RP filed a complaint alleging that when officers were called to a bar because she was disorderly, they forced her into the police car and stated that she was too aggressive for EMTs to examine her. She also complained that they put a mask over her head.

---

**Incident Review**

**Received:** Nov 25, 2017  
**Occurred:** Nov 25, 2017  
**Opened:** Dec 05, 2017  
**Assigned:** Dec 05, 2017  
**Due:** Jan 05, 2018

**Status:** Completed Dec 15, 2017 Disposition - Supervisor Review-Closed

**Incident summary:**

An employee of a coffee shop called to advise they needed Cahoots for a person in "crisis".

That they had been locked in the bathroom for an hour, but the bathroom door was now open. There were at least 20 calls holding, of which 4 were Cahoots calls. Cahoots was on an additional call. Within 40 minutes the employee called back to advise the patient was not breathing or conscious and an off duty Cahoots employee was on scene doing CPR.

---

#### Supervisor Action

**Received:** Nov 27, 2017  
**Occurred:** Nov 25, 2017  
**Opened:** Nov 28, 2017  
**Assigned:** Nov 28, 2017  
**Due:** Dec 28, 2017

**Status:** Completed Dec 28, 2017 Disposition - Supervisor Review-Closed

#### Incident summary:

RP reported an EPD SUV driving without headlights on. RP felt this was dangerous. RP does not need a call back.

---

#### Supervisor Action

**Received:** Nov 29, 2017  
**Occurred:** Nov 28, 2017  
**Opened:** Nov 29, 2017  
**Assigned:** Nov 29, 2017  
**Due:** Dec 29, 2017

**Status:** Completed Dec 26, 2017 Disposition - Supervisor Review-Closed

#### Incident summary:

RP complained about the service he received when he tried to call EPD to report someone keeping an item he had refunded the cost for after an eBay sale.

---

#### Supervisor Action

**Received:** Nov 29, 2017  
**Occurred:** Nov 29, 2017  
**Opened:** Nov 29, 2017  
**Assigned:** Nov 30, 2017  
**Due:** Dec 29, 2017

**Status:** Completed Dec 11, 2017 Disposition - Supervisor Review-Closed

#### Incident summary:

RP contacted the Auditor's Office upset that he cannot get Animal Control to do anything about a neighbor's barking dog, except give a warning, he has called at least 3 times in the past year but had given up until today when the dog barked continuously from 8:30am until he called right before 1pm with it still barking because he has workers in this yard. He was told they were on another call and would try and get to it, but would need to hear the dog. RP wants Animal Control to solve the problem, not just warn the neighbor, as that has not helped.

---

#### Incident Review

**Received:** Nov 30, 2017  
**Occurred:** Nov 19, 2017  
**Opened:** Dec 04, 2017  
**Assigned:** Dec 04, 2017  
**Due:** Jan 03, 2018

**Status:** Completed Dec 15, 2017 Disposition - Supervisor Review-Closed

**Incident summary:**

RP contacted the Auditor's Office about an incident in which he was denied access to his grandson at the hospital by an EPD officer even though he was able to provide the Power of Attorney he holds over his grandson's medical care and any and all rights that a natural parent has. RP's grandson had been take to the hospital for swallowing some sort of pill while in the care of the child's father. The officer told him that the father was in their custody for a heroin charge and that she did not know where the child was. RP argued that because of his PoA he should have been take to the child and the child released to him after any emergency room care, but the child was turned over to DHS and is now in foster care.

---

**Supervisor Action**

**Received:** Dec 01, 2017  
**Occurred:** Oct 12, 2017  
**Opened:** Dec 04, 2017  
**Assigned:** Dec 04, 2017  
**Due:** Jan 04, 2018

**Status:** Completed Dec 18, 2017 Disposition - Supervisor Review-Closed

**Incident summary:**

RP contacted the Auditor's Office concerned that she has been unable to get a return call related to a case in which her daughter's car was stolen. The car was recovered with a lot of damage and all her daughter's belongings missing. RP has been trying to convey newly discovered information to EPD and has called several times, but she has never been transferred to the employee's voicemail or gotten a call back.

---

**Incident Review**

**Received:** Dec 02, 2017  
**Occurred:** Dec 02, 2017  
**Opened:** Dec 04, 2017  
**Assigned:** Dec 05, 2017  
**Due:** Jan 04, 2018

**Status:** Completed Dec 15, 2017 Disposition - Supervisor Review-Closed

**Incident summary:**

Central Lane 911 received a call from a woman regarding an unattended child in a vehicle at a store. The caller advised a 5 year old child was alone in the car with the engine running and no adults for 10 minutes. The caller later advised a female and two other children had left the area. A supervisor received information that the vehicle was registered to an EPD employee. Normal protocol was to dispatch officers to the registered address for a welfare check on the child. The supervisor responded to the residence for a welfare check, re-contacted the complainant, and advised his chain of command and IA. The supervisor learned that the child in question was nearly 10 years old and the welfare check revealed that the child was being well cared for; in addition, the supervisor learned that the involved employee was not in the area and that this incident had involved the employee's spouse. It did not appear that the child had been left in a situation that would endanger the health or welfare of

the child. The supervisor entered the incident in BlueTeam as a record, though it turned out to not involve any employees of EPD. The supervisor recommended, and our office concurred, that this be closed at intake.

---

#### Supervisor Action

**Received:** Dec 08, 2017  
**Occurred:** Dec 08, 2017  
**Opened:** Dec 14, 2017  
**Assigned:**  
**Due:**

**Status:** Completed Dec 14, 2017 Disposition - Supervisor Review-Closed

#### Incident summary:

An officer was arresting a woman for Assault IV APA. Once she was in custody she asked him if she was being arrested due to her race.

A supervisor spoke with the RP who advised that she asked it due to previous encounters with the Roseburg Police Department.

---

#### Supervisor Action

**Received:** Dec 08, 2017  
**Occurred:** Dec 08, 2017  
**Opened:** Dec 14, 2017  
**Assigned:**  
**Due:**

**Status:** Completed Dec 14, 2017 Disposition - Supervisor Review-Closed

#### Incident summary:

The complainant on a call was found by two officers to have initiated a false report. He had been admonished several times about not making a false report before he was taken into custody. Once in custody, the RP stated that he was only being arrested due to his race.

---

#### Supervisor Action

**Received:** Dec 11, 2017  
**Occurred:** Nov 29, 2017  
**Opened:** Dec 11, 2017  
**Assigned:** Dec 11, 2017  
**Due:** Jan 10, 2018

**Status:** Completed Dec 14, 2017 Disposition - Supervisor Review-Closed

#### Incident summary:

RP commented on social media that he saw two different officers in patrol cars texting, neither vehicle had their headlights on, and RP was unable to get their attention as they were so engrossed in their phones.

---

#### Supervisor Action

**Received:** Dec 11, 2017  
**Occurred:** Nov 14, 2017

**Opened:** Dec 11, 2017  
**Assigned:** Dec 11, 2017  
**Due:** Jan 10, 2018

**Status:** Completed Dec 18, 2017 Disposition - Supervisor Review-Closed

**Incident summary:**

RP stopped by with a concern about EPD officers who have come to his apartment late in the evening (2100 to 0100) to talk with him about some text messages. RP does not open the door at this time because of his apartment's quiet hours and has told officers to comeback in the daytime for such a trivial matter. RP complained that the officers banged loudly on his door and shone their flashlights into his window. RP also suspected officers had removed stickers from his door.

---

**Supervisor Action**

**Received:** Dec 11, 2017  
**Occurred:** Dec 10, 2017  
**Opened:** Dec 13, 2017  
**Assigned:** Dec 13, 2017  
**Due:** Jan 13, 2018

**Status:** Completed Dec 26, 2017 Disposition - Supervisor Review-Closed

**Incident summary:**

RP contacted the Auditor's Office with a concern about the tone an officer took with his wife who was in a traffic accident in which her air bag deployed. RP's wife was disoriented and couldn't find her insurance card. The officer's response was "If you don't give me your insurance right now, I'm going to cite you." He then made her call her insurance to get a policy number. RP stated that his wife was seriously injured in the accident.

---

**IA17-312                      Supervisor Action**

**Received:** Dec 14, 2017  
**Occurred:** Dec 14, 2017  
**Opened:** Dec 15, 2017  
**Assigned:** Dec 15, 2017  
**Due:** Jan 14, 2018

**Status:** Completed Dec 26, 2017 Disposition - Supervisor Review-Closed

**Incident summary:**

RP stopped by the Auditor's Office to report that when he called the non-emergency line to ask for an officer to take a report on a man who has been menacing him, and he had just found out his identity, the call taker told him she would not send an officer.

---

**Supervisor Action**

**Received:** Dec 16, 2017  
**Occurred:** Dec 14, 2017  
**Opened:** Dec 18, 2017  
**Assigned:** Dec 18, 2017  
**Due:** Jan 17, 2018

**Status:** Completed Dec 29, 2017 Disposition - Supervisor Review-Closed

**Incident summary:**

RP filed a complaint upset that officers failed to take a police report and cite a driver who was at fault in an injury accident in which she was involved. RP was told it was the officer's discretion and it was policy unless there was serious physical injury. RP was transported to the hospital and can't understand such a policy.

---

**Incident Review**

**Received:** Dec 23, 2017  
**Occurred:** Dec 23, 2017  
**Opened:** Dec 29, 2017  
**Assigned:** Dec 29, 2017  
**Due:** Jan 29, 2018

**Status:** Completed Dec 29, 2017 Disposition - Supervisor Review-Closed

**Incident summary:**

A supervisor was contacted by an officer who had arrested a DUII driver. The driver was claiming that the employee had punched him in the face as he was putting him in the back of a car; the officer denied striking the RP or using any reportable force. The supervisor reviewed body-worn camera footage of the interaction and spoke with the involved employee. The video showed that the employee did not strike the RP. In addition, medics were called (who cleared the RP). The supervisor attempted to talk to the RP and observed no physical injuries.

---

**Supervisor Action**

**Received:** Dec 27, 2017  
**Occurred:** Dec 26, 2017  
**Opened:**  
**Assigned:**  
**Due:**

**Status:** Completed Dec 28, 2017 Disposition - Dismissed-Other

**Incident summary:**

RP alleged that she has been followed and/or stalked by EPD officers, approximately 6 times over the past 6 months. The most recent was yesterday when a motor officer pulled next to her vehicle at approximately and looked into her vehicle, then pulled into a business. She feels that she is being watched.

Dismissed by Auditor.

**The Eugene Police Department received 29 commendations from citizens in November, 2017. Below is a sample of those commendations.**

A citizen commended an officer for their communication skills displayed during a 'Disorderly Subject' call for service the officer had responded to. The citizen's son suffers from Asperger's and during the incident, the citizen felt the officer was "extremely calming and professional". The citizen stated their son was treated "with the utmost respect".

An officer was commended by a citizen that recently had the privilege accompanying the officer on a ride-along. The citizen commented, "I was so very impressed by your compassion, professionalism, and the huge contribution you make every day in keeping our community safe. I always have had respect for police officers, but it wasn't until spending part of a shift with you that I truly have a deep personal gratitude for the work of the police department."

A citizen commended an officer for their efforts in retrieving the citizen's stolen wallet and personally returning it on the officer's personal time. The citizen commented, "I really appreciate it. I'm not necessarily a fan of the police, but I thought that he and his supervisor should know he did a good job."

Officers were commended by a citizen for the way they handled a situation where the citizen was having a mental breakdown. The officers listened, gave recommendations to local programs that could provide assistance and worked with CAHOOTS to ensure the citizen was taken care of. The citizen reflected on the situation and felt they could have been arrested due to the demonstrated behavior. The citizen commented, "They were considerate. They showed love."

An officer was commended for their actions when an officer from an outside agency was in a situation on Interstate-5 alone with two theft case subjects, awaiting backup that was still miles away. The EPD officer was passing through the area and saw they may need assistance. The EPD officer identified as an off-duty officer and was able to provide cover to the lone officer until backup arrived. A superior of that officer commented, "I want to thank (officer's name) for stopping to help...He saw a police officer in need of assistance, and he immediately provided that assistance. I hope this letter reflects the appreciation we feel toward (officer's name) and the Eugene Police Department."

An officer received a 'Thank You' letter from the parents of a young man that the officer had recently interacted with during a call for service. The citizen felt the officer displayed "excellence and professionalism" during the interaction. The citizen commented, "You used fair and firm words, you analyzed the situation, you provided alternative solutions. In short, you are talented and professional. We in the River Road area and all in Eugene are blessed to have you to serve and to protect. Thank you!"

A citizen commended officers and a dispatcher that assisted them on a call for service that was initially thought to be a home invasion. The citizen commented, "While the event fortunately turned out to be a false alarm, for twelve minutes your dispatcher kept me calm, while summoning help for what I thought was a home invasion incident. I was extremely embarrassed when it became evident that it was a false alarm, but your police officers were understanding, professional, and efficient in wrapping up the whole ordeal with little fanfare. All true professionals!"

A citizen commended an officer through social media for the positive interaction that was displayed with local community members. The citizen commented, "We do things right here in our beautiful state of Oregon. After being locked out of her car for the umpteenth time during a frantic and stressful morning this kind officer from the Eugene Police Dept. was able to retrieve her keys for her. What I love about this picture is that this breaks down barriers between police officers and people of color. This officer could've passed them and went along his day or automatically labeled them as criminals who were trying to steal their own car. He didn't. He automatically helped. Protect and Serve. Through all of the turmoil and prejudice that happens in this world, this small act of kindness changed his day and theirs. He was a man that helped them during a time when they needed it the most."

An officer was commended by a citizen for the "outstanding job" they performed during a recent incident involving a sexual assault victim. The citizen commented, "I had a call out on Monday night at the University District and (officer's name) was so incredible. I feel like she really needs to be recognized for her great trauma-informed work!"

An officer was commended by a citizen for the positive interaction they had with the officer. The citizen had been pulled over by the officer on their bicycle due to concerns the officer had observed. The citizen commented, "She was incredibly considerate and understanding with me, especially in light of the fact that I was not showing the necessary awareness of my surroundings nor demonstrating responsibility as a biker. It was a very effective wake up call for me regarding the level of attention I need to be maintaining while on the road, and I really appreciated the officer's willingness to give me the benefit of the doubt. She gets my sincere thanks."

A citizen commended an officer for their professionalism after the citizen had been involved in a motor vehicle accident. The citizen commented, "I just wanted to say a quick thank you for your professionalism, empathy, and much needed humor in the aftermath of the crash. I was pretty shaken. It could've turned out much worse. Your handling of the situation definitely reduced my stress level by the time we parted ways."