



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, February 13, 2018 - 5:30 p.m.
Atrium Building, 99 West 10th Avenue
Saul Room, Third Floor
Contact: Vicki Cox, 682-5016

| <u>ITEM</u> | <u>TIME (Starting)</u> |
|---|-------------------------------|
| 1. Agenda and Materials Review | 5 minutes (5:30 pm) |
| 2. Public Comment | 5 minutes (5:35 pm) |
| 3. Minutes Approval (Minutes from January 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. Training Topic: Public Safety Forum Review | 30 minutes (5:55 pm) |
| 6. Break | 10 minutes (6:25 pm) |
| 7. Case Review: Allegation of Off-Duty Misconduct | 50 minutes (6:35 pm) |
| 8. Auditor Report | 15 minutes (7:25 pm) |
| 9. Adjourn – Next Meeting March 13, 2018 | (7:40 pm) |

MINUTES

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

January 9, 2018
5:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Chris Wig, Chair; Rick Roseta, Steve McIntire, Carolyn Williams, Civilian Review Board members; Mark Gissiner, Leia Pitcher, Beatrice Hernandez, Police Auditor's Office.

ABSENT: Maurice Denner, Jim Hargreaves, Heather Marek (Civilian Review Board members).

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

1. AGENDA AND MATERIALS REVIEW

Mr. Wig moved the introduction of Agenda Item Number 5, "Introduction of Interim Director of Public Safety: David James" to Agenda Item Number 2.

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

2. INTRODUCTION OF INTERIM DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC SAFETY: DAVID JAMES

Mr. James introduced himself as Interim Executive Director of Public Safety for Eugene Police Department (EPD). He was honored to serve the City of Eugene for the next 90 days. Mr. James explained he had been with EPD for 30 days already. His purpose was to help direct operations of the Department as they hire a new police chief. He was a subcontractor for the firm conducting the search for police chief. Mr. James was a chief for 15 years at one point and then had a consulting firm.

Mr. James told CRB it was his first time in Oregon. His role here was to serve CRB and the community. As he directed operations to help make the transition, he would be looking at its department and operations; he would report back to the City Manager of things of importance. Mr. James would look at applications for chief of police and would help in the hiring process. He acknowledged the importance of CRB and thanked the board.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Wig declared there was no public comment.

4. MINUTES APPROVAL — November 2017

There were no changes to the November 2017 minutes. Mr. Wig deemed the minutes approved by acclamation.

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

Mr. McIntire reported he would have to miss the Police Commission meeting on Thursday, January 11, 2018. He said another CRB member could attend in his place if they wanted.

Mr. McIntire shared an article from the Register Guard ran on December 24, 2017 about homeless man. In the situation, the man's shopping cart was on fire and the authorities of Springfield were called. The man ran from authorities, jumped in the river and swam, and they waited for him on the other side. Mr. McIntire said the man's life was in that shopping cart; he thought a few changes could have made the story end to be a heartwarming one. Instead of being given a warm shelter, the man was taken to the hospital where he was arrested after his body temperature raised to safe levels.

Neither Mr. Roseta nor Ms. Williams had statements.

Mr. Wig said he felt good about the 2017 Police Executive Research Forum (PERF) report, because many issues discussed at CRB and the Police Commission were also observed by an outside party of the community.

6. CASE REVIEW: ALLEGATION OF AN UNTRUTHFULNESS DURING AN ADMINISTRATIVE INVESTIGATION

Mr. Roseta declined to participate in the case review. He was concerned about CRB reviewing the case; he thought it was not a matter for CRB.

Mr. Denner emailed a statement to Mr. Wig reading, "I know several employees in this matter. Some better than others. I have a 'conflict of interest' under Oregon Administrative Rules. However, that does not prevent me from making comments and participating in discussion."

1. Summary of Facts

- Our office met with Retired Supervisor B in late February 2017. The retired supervisor believed he had additional information related to the case that was reviewed by this board in November 2017.
- The retired supervisor was concerned that Supervisor A had been untruthful during the related investigation. The retired supervisor stated in his intake interview that he had met with Supervisor A socially in the fall of 2016. Supervisor A had discussed the circumstances surrounding the earlier investigation – specifically, how upset his spouse had been about a picture he had taken.
- The retired employee later met socially with the person who had complained about that picture and understood that Supervisor A's explanation during the prior investigation was different than the one he had told the retired employee.
- The complaint was classified as an Allegation of Misconduct (specifically, an allegation of untruthfulness) and forwarded to an independent investigator for follow up.
- The outside investigator interviewed Retired Supervisor B and Supervisor A, as well as witnesses. The investigation was submitted to the City in May 2017. The investigator submitted follow up information in June 2017.
- Our office reviewed the investigation and found it to be unbiased and complete. Our recommendation to Chief Kerns, submitted later in June 2017, was that the allegation be sustained.
- Chief Kerns issued his adjudication in July 2017, which sustained the allegation.

- Supervisor A followed the prescribed grievance procedure, and the City Manager issued a final adjudication in November 2017. The City Manager found insufficient evidence to support the allegation of untruthfulness.

2. Allegations

1. Truthfulness: That Supervisor A was not truthful during the administrative investigation of a complaint that he had violated the City's Respectful Work Environment policy.

3. Recommended Adjudications

1. Truthfulness

- a. Auditor's Office: Sustained
- b. Chief: Sustained
- c. City Manager: Insufficient Evidence

4. Issues for CRB Discussion

- Complaint Intake and Classification
 - Intake interview with Retired Supervisor B
 - Classification: Allegation of Misconduct

Ms. Williams appreciated they used the same outside investigator – that added continuity. Mr. Wig agreed that doing so was thoughtful.

- Complaint Investigation and Monitoring
 - Outside investigator

Ms. Williams during investigation retired supervisor B appeared reliable. It made her question Supervisor A's credibility. Mr. Gissiner said there was follow up with retired Supervisor B personally, initiated with the investigator, however, Mr. Gissiner was not present for the interviews conducted.

Mr. Wig thought the follow up interview with Retired Supervisor B was very important and well done. He noted it enhanced credibility of information that the Auditor's Office and the Chief used to make their recommendations.

- Relevant Department Policies and Practices
 - 1101.1.B.29 Truthfulness

Mr. Wig clarified City and Police Auditor policies. He said based on how the policy was written, it was not against policy to take inappropriate pictures at work, or even sexually harass someone– but it was policy that one was not to lie or be dishonest.

Mr. McIntire thought case was reopened based on untruthfulness. He was not sure that the respectful workplace expectations were understood by Supervisor A. Mr. McIntire found it weird that the policy deemed violated was the credibility clause. He reiterated the picture taken was considered inappropriate, and he did not understand how that was confused with following a respectful workplace environment. He found it troubling that multiple investigations had occurred. Mr. McIntire said the matter should have never been brought this far. He noted it was acknowledged that a picture had been taken, and that picture was a violation of City policy – there seemed to be an issue with department policies and practices.

Ms. Williams found the idea of truthfulness in the case to be important. She noted the Chief sustained allegation of dishonesty; but the City Manager did not. Ms. Williams thought the policy needed reworking, because it is phrased so expansively to be rendered almost meaningless.

Mr. Gissiner explained how the incident was reported; the employee reported the incident to her supervisor, and then it was eventually reported to the Chief. He was unsure of what caused the delay to Human Resources (HR). The Director of HR interviewed all parties once and submitted the investigative report to the Chief. The Police Auditor was still not involved. Mr. Gissiner said several months later, he received an anonymous email that detailed complaint and said the employee had never heard the result of case other than “it was taken care of.” After that anonymous email, Ms. Pitcher interviewed the employee. Mr. Gissiner said the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) requires the complainant be communicated with, and that did not occur. He added the employee had a right to file a complaint about misconduct, and he thought the circumstances were aligned with serious misconduct. Mr. Gissiner believed if the issue were handled well at entry, it could have remained in HR; but because of how it was handled and how the employee approached the Police Auditor, Mr. Gissiner felt the Police Auditor’s Office had an obligation to investigate.

- Policy and/or Training Considerations

Ms. Williams said she did not have any training recommendations; she thought honesty was important, but it was hard to train people to be honest. Mr. McIntire thought training on a respectful workplace and the policy was needed. He agreed truthfulness important. Mr. Wig agreed with training suggestions, and thought the policy was a very baseline thing.

Ms. Pitcher said the invitation for an IA interview had a truthfulness admonishment; participants should be very clear on the requirement to be truthful.

- Adjudication Recommendations

- Grievance procedure for non-represented employees

Mr. McIntire did not agree with the appeal on truthfulness. He understood the Chief weighed all facts, and his finding was not wrong, it was reasonable. Mr. McIntire did not think the City Manager should have substituted his own opinion for the Chief’s. Ms. Williams agreed, and thought the Auditor and Chief were spot on in their recommendations. She considered the conclusion of the Chief to be accurate, so the final adjudication by the City Manager was confusing to her. Ms. Williams thought it was unusual that the whole process could be overruled by the City Manager. She asked that could happen, and how common the occurrence was.

Mr. Gissiner said the City Manager was head of the executive branch, which included disciplinary authority over employees. That authority was usually delegated to a department director, but it was within his authority to be the final decision maker. For non-represented employees, a sustained finding could be appealed to the Chief and to the City Manager. Mr. Gissiner said it had occurred in the past when a supervisor at EPD appealed to City Manager; Mr. Gissiner did not know the outcome, as there was never a memo indicating a decision was overturned. Ms. Pitcher said the Police Auditor would not be informed

if the discipline decision was changed, as the Auditor's office is removed from the disciplinary phase of the process.

Mr. Roseta said CRB did not have the right to comment on what the City Administrator could do. He thought the Chief was involved because he was administrating a City policy, not an EPD policy. Mr. Roseta did not think the City ordinance on CRB, or the board's own policies, allowed involvement. Mr. Gissiner said the ordinance allowed CRB to comment on adjudication. Mr. Roseta read the ordinance out loud; he reiterated it was not CRB's right to discuss whether a City policy was violated. He noted there was not a complaint about police conduct by a citizen, and CRB was only to review those complaints made by citizens.

Mr. Denner "did not follow the City Manager's decision to sustain the allegation regarding a 'respectful workplace,' and then subsequent decision to find insufficient evidence regarding 'truthfulness.' If a person (the Manager) finds in the first complaint grounds to sustain the complaint, then it follows that there is sufficient (credible) evidence. The Chief's adjudication memo points out that the accused did not delete the photo, because his wife saw it. However, the accused is a long-time employee and may have served a consequence regarding respectful work environment. Additional sanctions may not have been required."

Mr. Wig was baffled by the reversal of the initial adjudication. He did not feel anything in CRB members' packets would support that action. He explained to the public what was included in CRB members' packets. He said EPD IA was excellent at crafting narrative, while supervisors and the Auditor provided logical interpretation of the narrative. Mr. Wig said the case built up a lot of logical pieces, but then with no additional information as to why the decision was overturned. Based off the City Manager's adjudication, Mr. Wig thought the case showed a level of untruthfulness that was not okay by EPD, but was okay by City policy.

Mr. Hargreaves wrote he had "not been able to rationally reconcile the findings by the City Manager that the incident did indeed happen and violate policy, but the accused didn't lie about it. Seems like pure and simple political decision by the City Manager." Mr. Wig said lying and sexual harassment were not acceptable in any place of employment, especially within the City.

Mr. McIntire returned to Mr. Roseta's earlier comment and said that although the complaint was made by an EPD employee, the individual was also a City of Eugene citizen. He said it still made sense for CRB to conduct a review of the case. Ms. Williams added that the integrity of officers affected the entire community, and agreed that it made sense for CRB to review the case.

Mr. Denner was "concerned with the lack of timeliness in this process and the revelation to the press that allowed the outcomes to be discussed publicly. These two factors add to the embarrassment of the person whose photo was the subject of the inquiry."

Mr. Wig said someone was hurt by these actions, and the policy was violated – someone was subjected to an unsafe work environment.

7. BREAK

CRB took a break from 6:05 p.m. until 6:19 p.m.

8. TRAINING TOPIC: DISCUSSION OF POLICE EXECUTIVE RESEARCH FORUM REPORT ON EPD

Mr. Wig introduced the training topic, a discussion of the Police Executive Research Forum (PERF) Report. Mr. Gissiner said the original training topic was to discuss the public safety forum that was held on December 6, 2018. Ms. Hernandez said one officer fluent in Spanish had the best relationship with the audience. She said there were about 60 to 100 people present. Mr. Gissiner said the forum was entirely in Spanish, which was remarkable for any city event. He thought the forum went well. Mr. Gissiner was going to ask the officer to come and discuss takeaways from event, but he was unable to come. Hopefully, the officer could attend a future meeting.

Mr. Gissiner said the report from PERF was discussed at the CRB meeting in November 2017. He emailed copies of the report to CRB members. Mr. Gissiner explained that over the years, several different reports were done. Most recently, there were reports released in 2002 and 2005. Prior to the PERF report, Chief Kerns asked PERF to do a review with several goals, but one specifically was diversity within the department, both gender and racial or ethnic makeup. One thing prevalent in 2005 was oversight function. Mr. Gissiner spoke with people involved in the report, and in 2017 there was a bigger oversight process so that was not discussed greatly in the 2017 PERF report. He thought there were many good recommendations, and noted strengths, weaknesses and opportunities were included.

Mr. Roseta wondered if the PERF report was made available to potential police chief candidates. Ms. Pitcher thought it was linked in the position advertisement. Mr. Wig said if he were applying for the position, he would plan to be very familiar with the material. Mr. Gissiner pointed out most things were from a police perspective.

Mr. Gissiner said an interesting point in the PERF report, was regarding performance evaluations and using them for basis of promotions. Evaluation of day to day performance was not considered enough; however, Mr. Gissiner thought an employee's history should be valued as more important than a 1 or 2-hour interview. He noted that point was highlighted in the report as well.

Mr. Roseta asked how long the PERF team had been in Eugene. Mr. Gissiner was unsure, but he did receive a few calls from the team to clarify some issues. Mr. Gissiner said there were 2 people, and the pair had done 30 to 60 interviews. Ms. Williams said performance evaluations were a concern to her as well. In addition, Ms. Williams thought it was interesting that 14 sworn women left the force, and the number of women in leadership positions were low. She thought the fact that numbers of women overall in the force was low was something to consider.

Mr. McIntire said the Police Commission asked to have a presentation on performance evaluations. He explained EPD was not conducting performance evaluations. Mr. McIntire thought it was important for people leading the organization to know policy and what they were expecting from subordinates. If officers and supervisors were not receiving regular feedback, they were flying blind. He said they were planning on improving the process, and it was outlined in the strategic plan. He noted less than 52% of participation rate in PERF – he thought more input would help. Lack of transparency was an issue regarding internal communications, and there was an unfair and inconsistent process for promotions and

discipline. He wondered how getting demoted would factor in to performance evaluations. Mr. McIntire agreed that because someone tested well, it did not mean they were a good leader. He thought it was important to find ways to observe leadership skills, other than testing, to see how functional an officer would be in a leadership role. Mr. McIntire said people who responded were consistent among themselves and he felt the issues presented were valid and that the PERF provided a lot of information. Mr. McIntire said there were things that needed to be worked on in EPD, but all in all, the report was very favorable. He thought it was comprehensive and reflected well on EPD.

Mr. Gissiner had been told by a few people that officers felt the oversight process was picking on them. He noted organizational climate was important within EPD. Mr. Gissiner added the previous case reviewed was indicative that people do come to the Police Auditor to file complaints. The only mention of accountability in PERF was “lack of trust in leadership to hold people accountable”; however, he thought there was an appreciation of Police Auditor and CRB. The statement was not overt in document, but it was implied the bodies were important to the community. Mr. Gissiner said the oversight cases sometimes drag on for years; one thing very important to him was timeliness. He thought timeliness was owed to employees.

Mr. Wig found the PERF report valuable. It was an external validator of certain issues that CRB, the Police Auditor, and the Police Commission had discussed and had concerns about. He said diversity was one of those issues. Mr. Wig added that the promotion process problem was very well fleshed out. In addition, he thought the organizational climate survey was particularly poignant, as men provided more favorable responses than women, regarding placement of special assignments. He thought ways to open the culture within the department would be helpful, and agreed with the PERF report’s suggestion of the Chief of Police exploring email updates to foster communication among staff. Mr. Wig noted on page 11 of the report, it said the department should ensure policies, accountability measures, and should ensure that sexual harassment is not permitted. Mr. Wig said the report explained that the oversight process needed to be tailored to the community – he felt good that Eugene did cater well to its community. Mr. Wig concluded he was hopeful that in ten years, EPD and CRB would see improvements in the report and continue to address other issues.

9. AUDITOR REPORT

Mr. Gissiner reported EPD had one less sergeant in internal affairs, leading to a larger workload for the sergeant on duty. He reviewed three complaint reports that day, all where the subject was in severe mental health crisis, or significant intoxication where any reasoning was absent. He thought people suffering mental health crises seemed to be primary contacts for officers. Mr. Gissiner noted these crises were happening communitywide. Mr. Gissiner explained in some police interactions with a mentally unstable person, decades of experience and training could not help the situation; however, CAHOOTS was often there to help. Mr. Gissiner concluded there needed more investment from the county, state, and federal governments.

10. ADJORN

Mr. Wig adjourned the CRB meeting at 6:48 p.m.

(Recorded by Marina Brassfield, LCOG)

Eugene Police Department

January 2018 Closed Case Report

Incident type: IA Investigation
Status: Completed
Occurred date: Oct 9, 2017
Class/sub-class: Allegation of Misconduct / Performance
Disposition: Sustained

RP stopped by the Auditor's office to report an incident at her place of work in which a man came into a store and asked employees if they would call Cahoots. They were told by the call taker that they were very busy and it would be awhile. When they told the man, he stated something to the effect of he would hate to have to shoot up the place. Hours passed without CAHOOTS showing up, while the man waited and intermittently made the same statements. RP called 911 and told them about what was happening and how scared they were, and was questioned whether they had seen a gun or not, which at that point they had not and were told it was not a priority. Hours after the initial call, the employees convinced the man to take a cab and he left. No one at EPD ever followed up with them.

1. 1101.1.B.9 Unsatisfactory Performance - On October 9, 2017 an employee did not follow appropriate caller interrogation on a report of an escalating public assist call for CAHOOTS services, nor did the call taker provide the caller with any safety instructions when the call evolved into a potentially armed and violent situation.
 2. 1101.1.B.9 Unsatisfactory Performance - On October 9, 2017 an employee failed to dispatch a police response when a public assist call for CAHOOTS services evolved into a potentially armed and violent situation.
 3. 1101.1.B.9 Unsatisfactory Performance - On October 9, 2017 an employee failed to ensure a police response was sent when a public assist call for CAHOOTS services evolved into a potentially armed and violent situation.
-

Incident type: IA Investigation
Status: Completed
Received date: Oct 17, 2017
Class/sub-class: Allegation of Misconduct / Performance
Disposition: Sustained

1101.1.B.9 Unsatisfactory Performance - It is alleged that an employee failed to take appropriate action when processing a call for service, which resulted in a delay in dispatching emergency medical personnel.

2 incidents displayed.

Eugene Police Department

January 2018 Open Case Report

Incident type: IA Investigation
Status: Active
Received date: Jan 5, 2018
Class/sub-class: Allegation of Misconduct / Conduct
Disposition:

1. 1101.1.B.7 Courtesy - It is alleged that an employee made a comment to a subordinate employee that included racially disparaging language.
2. 1101.1.B.7 Courtesy - It is alleged that an employee commented disparagingly about another employee's sexual orientation.
3. 1101.1.B.7 Courtesy - It is alleged that an employee called an EPD supervisor a profane name in the workplace.

Allegations:
Conduct - 1101.1.B.25 Unbecoming Conduct
Courtesy - 1101.1.B.7 Courtesy

Incident type: IA Investigation
Status: Active
Received date: Jan 5, 2018
Class/sub-class: Allegation of Misconduct / Conduct
Disposition:

1. 1101.1.B.15 Insubordination - It is alleged that an employee failed to obey verbal direction of a supervisor.

Allegations:
Conduct - 1101.1.B.15 Insubordination

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Jan 5, 2018
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance
Disposition:

RP reported that when he attempted to file a car theft report and that the thief attempted to run him over, an officer told him that it was a civil issue. RP stated that he had the name of the operator of the vehicle and knew that he had been recently arrested for a probation violation. RP stated that all he wanted was a police report filed, but that the officer refused.

The complainant would like a quick response as he feels threatened by the alleged thief.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Jan 8, 2018
Class/sub-class: Inquiry
Disposition: Dismissed-Other

RP reported an incident in which his son had a seizure while at pharmacy with his mother, RP's girlfriend. RP claims that she was threatened with arrest by officers, and treated as if she was a drug abuser during a scary incident with her child. RP is highly disappointed in how the situation was handled, which caused them public humiliation.

Per Auditor - Dismissed/Other -

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Jan 9, 2018
Class/sub-class: Inquiry
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP contacted the Auditor's office with a concern about a 30 day exclusion citation he received for illegal camping. RP had received a warning and had moved from the location of the warning. At a later date, he was parked in a park area and felt that he was singled out by an employee, given the citation and had his vehicle towed. RP feels he was profiled due to his race and his homeless status as other people in the park who had been there longer were not cited or towed. RP also took exception to being listed as a transient, as he has a mailing address at White Bird and is registered to vote in Lane County. The citation was dismissed by the judge in January.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Jan 10, 2018
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance
Disposition:

RP stopped by the Auditor's Office to report, that when he called the non-emergency number to report the theft of most of his belongings by his brother, the call-taker listened for a while and then basically told him the theft was a civil issue, and hung up on him.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Jan 11, 2018
Class/sub-class: Inquiry
Disposition:

RP sent an email to the Police Chief Email upset with a speeding citation she was given. RP alleges that the officer interrogated her for over 25 minutes, checking her car over and over, and questioning whether the car was hers or not. RP also described an incident in 2011 in which she felt she was profiled because she had Muslim students with her in her car.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Jan 11, 2018
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Service level
Disposition:

RP contacted the Auditor's Office with a concern that after 7 months of speaking to many different

people she still has been unable to get EPD to enforce the prohibitive camping issue on the Fern Ridge Bike Path. RP is harassed each and every time she walks the path and feels that every citizen should be able to enjoy the bike paths.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Jan 12, 2018
Class/sub-class: Inquiry
Disposition:

RPs stopped by the Auditor's Office with a concern about an officer who beginning in September has on 3 to 4 different occasions towed a friend's vehicle and travel trailer. The travel trailer was able to be retrieved, but was then towed again. Sometime around Christmas the trailer was towed a third time because a sewage cap wasn't on correctly. Their understanding was that she was never give previous warnings before being towed, just singled out for the towing. They were later told that the officer who towed the vehicle was seen driving it, and they believed the officer had purchased it after having it towed.

Incident type: Incident Review
Status: Active
Received date: Jan 17, 2018
Class/sub-class: Incident Review / Conduct
Disposition:

The involved person (who ultimately complained to an EPD supervisor) was contacted by EPD after she had been acting disorderly/erratic in the downtown core. As officers spoke to her, they noted she appeared to be suffering from mental illness. RP made numerous allegations against passers-by, accusing them of raping her. RP also claimed any nearby children she could see as her own.

During RP's contact, she made an allegation that an unknown Eugene Police Officer had secreted her inside a wooden box and fed her two slices of bologna.

RP was taken to University District Hospital (UDH) for a non-criminal mental hold, where the supervisor responded and spoke to her about her allegations.

Incident type: Incident Review
Status: Active
Received date: Jan 17, 2018
Class/sub-class: Incident Review / Performance
Disposition:

RP stopped by the Auditor's Office with a concern about how an officer, after asking her to leave the Kesey Square area, watched an incident where another person confront and attack her and her fiancé, and failed to intervene.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Jan 17, 2018
Class/sub-class: Inquiry
Disposition:

RP reported that she had been the victim of an assault at a tavern, which she believed to be a bias crime. RP stated to an officer (an acquaintance of hers) that the responding officers had failed to document the incident properly or make an arrest. RP then spoke with a supervisor further about the incident.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Jan 17, 2018
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance
Disposition: Dismissed-Other

RP contacted the Auditor's Office with a concern that officers, Fire and EMS have had him on camera for years. They watch him at his house, drive by and harass him by laughing at him. He is constantly being watched by them.

Dismiss – Auditor's Office.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Jan 18, 2018
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Conduct
Disposition: Dismissed-EE Not Active

UOPD contacted an EPD supervisor and stated that a person who had recently been arrested for DUII complained that she had been arrested by EPD seven years prior for the same crime, and that the arresting officer had asked her on a date.

Preliminary investigation showed that the employee is no longer an EPD employee. The complaint was forwarded to the proper agency.

Incident type: Incident Review
Status: Active
Received date: Jan 19, 2018
Class/sub-class: Incident Review / Conduct
Disposition:

RP contacted the Auditor's Office with a concern about an EPD officer who contacted his son during a walk out demonstration at his son's school. RP stated that the employee rudely told his son to shut up and tried to close the door on his son. RP stated that officer then threatened to arrest his son and shoved him away from the door and closed it.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Jan 22, 2018
Class/sub-class: Incident Review / Courtesy
Disposition:

RPs stopped by the Auditor's Office to report an officer who they believe is harassing them and trying to get them to leave the area. In the last two weeks they have had a couple of interactions with the officer citing them for trespassing at different locations.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Jan 22, 2018
Class/sub-class: Inquiry
Disposition:

RP contacted the Auditor's office concerned about an incident in which officers awoke him and his girlfriend banging on his window, when he went outside to see who and what was happening he was detained and handcuffed. RP wants to get to the bottom of the incident and know why officers were at his apartment as they were sleeping at the time and not in a dispute.

Incident type: Supervisor Intake
Status: Initial
Received date: Jan 23, 2018
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint/Performance
Disposition:

This incident was internally reported regarding how a 911 call related to a seizure was handled by the call taker. The call taker's actions appeared to be outside of standard call taking practices, policy and procedure.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Jan 24, 2018
Class/sub-class: Policy Complaint
Disposition:

RP contacted the Auditor's Office with a concern about not feeling protected, her car which is parked at the parking structure connected to her apartment has been broken into 3 times in 2 1/2 months. No one can tell her what kind of patrols are in place. She has spoken to both EPD and the E-park people and everyone just brushes her off and doesn't seem to care about the thefts.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Jan 25, 2018
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Service level
Disposition:

RP contacted the Auditor's Office with a request about a case in which he believes that a supplemental report needs to be written by EPD. RP has been speaking with the DEA about this case and would like to speak with a supervisor to have this done by EPD.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Jan 25, 2018
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Courtesy
Disposition:

RP reported an officer who interacted with her and was belligerent and rude. RP has permission to be at the address and was reporting a man trespassing.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Jan 26, 2018
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Service level
Disposition: Dismissed-Timeliness

RP emailed EPD about an issue with a receipt he felt he was due from LCC.
Per Auditor: Dismiss Timeliness

[22 incidents displayed.](#)

Police Commendations

The Eugene Police Department received 19 commendations from citizens in December, 2017.

The link below will access a summary of those commendations:

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