



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 11, 2020 - 5:30 p.m.

Bascom Room, Eugene Public Library, 100 West 10th Avenue

Contact: Vicki Cox, 682-5016

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>TIME (Starting)</u>
1. Agenda and Materials Review	5 minutes (5:30pm)
2. Public Comment	5 minutes (5:35pm)
3. Minutes Approval (Minutes from January meeting)	5 minutes (5:40pm)
4. Comments from Board Members and Commission Liaisons	10 minutes (5:45pm)
5. Training Topic: Training for New EPD Officers	30 minutes (5:55pm)
6. Break	10 minutes (6:25pm)
7. Case Review: Allegation of Improper Seizure of Phone from a Vehicle	45 minutes (6:35pm)
8. Auditor Report	15 minutes (7:20pm)
9. Adjourn – Next Meeting March 10, 2020	(7:35pm)

MINUTES
Civilian Review Board
Eugene Public Library, Bascom Room
100 West 10th Avenue

January 14, 2020
5:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Lindsey Foltz, Rick Roseta, Carolyn Williams, Bernadette Conover, Susan Gallagher-Smith, Awab Al-Rawe, Michael Hames-Garcia, Civilian Review Board members; Vicki Cox, Mark Gissiner, Beatriz Otero-Hernandez, Leia Pitcher, Police Auditor's Office; Angie San Miguel, Jason Berreth, Ron Tinseth, Cindy Coleman, Eugene Police Department; Ela Kubok, Human Rights Commission.

ABSENT: None.

Chair Lindsey Foltz convened the Civilian Review Board (CRB) at 5:31 p.m.

1. Agenda and Materials Review

Ms. Foltz said there was a proposed change to the agenda. Ms. Pitcher proposed that Ron Tinseth, presenting on demographics of officer-initiated police contact, might not show up till later in the meeting so they should do their case review first. All were in agreement.

There were no additional changes.

2. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

3. Minutes Approval

Mr. Roseta moved, seconded by Ms. Williams, to approve the minutes. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Comments from Board Members and Commission Liaisons

Ms. Kubok stated that the Human Rights Commission did not have a December meeting. However, they did have a public event on December 10 because it was international Human Rights Day. Ms. Kubok stated that at the next meeting they would elect their new chair and vice chair.

Ms. Foltz went to two police commission meetings. They talked about completing the police commission work plan. The goal of the plan was to improve equity and minority relations in the area. They brainstormed ways to do that and build relationships. The police commission also held its quarterly equity trainings and reviewed their detaining minors policy.

Ms. Williams believed they needed to be as transparent as possible when reviewing cases. She thought that when a CRB member had any relation to an officer in question they should state it for everyone. At the last meeting Ms. Williams had stated that she knew the officer a little, but felt like she was still able to be unbiased while talking about the case. If someone felt like they would be biased, they should state so and step out of the conversation.

Mr. Hames-Garcia said that he would have to leave early, around 6:40 p.m. and was sad to miss the police demographic break down.

Ms. Conover had been thinking about transparency. She reminded everyone that they needed to recognize, when in the community, the comments they were making and stay open to the CRB process.

Ms. Conover brought up a comment that Mr. Al-Rawe had posted on social media regarding a police shooting. She was concerned with the comments he had made, since it was the type of case that would be brought in front of them. Ms. Conover felt that Mr. Al-Rawe would not be able to look at cases from an unbiased standpoint. She understood that everyone had a right to free speech, but that there were still repercussions for it.

5. Case Review

Mr. Gissiner presented a slideshow entitled “Case Summary: Civilian Review Board, January 14, 2020”

I. Summary of Facts

- Officer A contacted a person who appeared to be violating the smoking ban in downtown. During the contact, a friend of the stopped person approached, filming the contact. The friend ultimately became the Reporting Party.
- RP identified his place of work and objected to EPD stopping his friend. RP shouted to others passing by about the stop and about his beliefs related to smoking downtown.
- Following the contact, Officer A contacted the owner of RP’s place of work. Officer A and the owner both stated that they have worked to build a positive working relationship, as the business owner has frequent contact with EPD.
- Officer A informed the owner about the police contact. Officer A stated that they were not looking to get RP fired. The owner stated that there were other personnel issues ongoing, and that it seemed like an obvious response.
- RP later came to the Auditor’s Office to complain that Officer A had retaliated against the RP, resulting in loss of employment.

Mr. Gissiner informed everyone that training encouraged officers to speak to businesses when an incident occurred, specifically in the downtown area.

II. Allegations

1. **103.5.5.2 Retaliation in the Community:** That Officer A retaliated against RP by contacting their employer and advising the employer that RP threatened officers who had contacted and detained RP’s friend. RP alleged they were fired as a direct result of Officer A providing false information to the employer.

III. Adjudications

- Retaliation
 - EPD chain of command recommendation: Unfounded
 - Auditor’s Office recommendation: Not Sustained
 - Chief of Police: Unfounded

IV. Issues for CRB Discussion

- Complaint Intake and Classification
 - Complaint filed with the Auditor’s Office
 - Classification: Allegation of Misconduct

Ms. Foltz asked if anyone had any connection to those involved. Ms. Williams stated that she had high school connections to an officer and a witness, but she did not feel like she would be biased.

Mr. Roseta could not find anything in the policy that covered the case, but he felt that retaliation was the closest. Even with that, he felt that the policy was very general and hard to pin down. Mr. Roseta stated

that there were many lines of communication (officer to owner, owner to manager, manager to employee) and felt that something was lost in the mix when talking.

Ms. Foltz thought it was odd that two different officers in their interviews said that the owner of the business did not want to jeopardize officer relations. She was concerned about their apparent fear that police services would be withheld from them. Ms. Foltz pointed out that the case came in in September and the case was closed in December, which was quick.

Mr. Hames-Garcia understood that something clearly happened during the exchange and it was reasonable to investigate it.

Ms. Gallagher-Smith noted that if the average person heard the introduction of the complaint then they would be worried. She was glad they were taking time to look at it.

Mr. Al-Rawe believed that even though the individual was loud and rude, that they were within their rights and no violation was made.

Ms. Conover stated that they were looking at the case not because of what happened on the street, but because of what happened afterwards. She thought if anything it was a poor judgment call on the officer to contact the owner, but since Mr. Gissiner said that was protocol it negated that.

- Complaint Investigation and Monitoring

Ms. Williams appreciated the depth of the investigation, she but thought there were some holes. She asked why Sergeant C was not contacted for an interview. Ms. Williams wondered what else they could have learned through that conversation. Mr. Berreth voiced that it did not seem relevant to interview Sergeant C. Mr. Gissiner added that on his body cam Sergeant C was on his phone, and not alarmed with what was happening. He thought that said enough about how threatened he felt. Ms. Williams emphasized that that was exactly her point, and that she would have liked to know Sergeant C's take on calling the business owner.

Ms. Foltz said that the investigation was very detailed and well organized.

Mr. Hames-Garcia stated that the investigation was very thorough. He liked the owner and manager interviews and felt like they added a lot. The exclusion of Sergeant C's interview did not bother Mr. Hames-Garcia. Since Officer A had a relation to the owner and the owner had asked to be notified of any instances, it made sense to just interview them.

Ms. Conover brought up that Sergeant C's time on the force might explain why they were unaffected by the scene going on around them.

Mr. Roseta found it helpful that the investigation did not stray into the initial interaction.

- Relevant Department Policies and Practices

Ms. Gallager-Smith thought that someone needed to review the retaliation policy further. She noted that it did not mention officer intent (knowing that the RP would be fired).

Mr. Al-Rawe inquired into if there was a policy regarding contacting employers. Mr. Gissiner responded that there was none, but that the downtown area had some expectations.

Ms. Conover said that Mr. Gissiner had talked about searching for a policy that fit the case and wanted to know more about that process. Mr. Gissiner explained that he looked into retaliation and thought about what contacting the owner would be under. Ms. Conover understood contacting business owners, but she felt that the owner could have articulated things more clearly to the manager or employee to avoid all the misunderstanding.

Ms. Foltz was curious about the reason that the call was originally made.

- Policy and/or Training Considerations

Ms. Gallagher-Smith wanted to compliment the covering officers who made it clear to the public what was happening. They were also communicated well about where they would touch someone, and they adjusted the handcuffs when they noticed they were tight.

Ms. Williams said that Officer B helped deescalate the situation. She did think there was a lot left to personal interpretation and noted some inconsistencies with Officer A's and Officer B's interviews (saying the person was screaming versus talking loudly). Ms. Williams thought that in general Officer A's report seemed hyperbolic. Mr. Gissiner gave the example that the word disorderly is used a lot, which could mean many different things.

Ms. Foltz agreed with Ms. Gallagher-Smith about how Officer B did a good job being aware of the other persons comfort levels.

Mr. Hames-Garcia agreed with Ms. Williams that Officer A's report was hyperbolic.

- Adjudication Recommendations

Mr. Al-Rawe agreed with the adjudication, but he believed that the call was maybe unnecessary.

Ms. Conover thought that the case was unfounded.

Mr. Roseta said it was not sustained. He understood that the call was made, he but felt they could not prove it went against policy. Ms. Williams agreed that the case was not sustained. She felt that something happened, but she did not know what policy it went against. Ms. Foltz concurred with not sustained and said that she thought about unfounded. Mr. Hames-Garcia was unsure on what founded versus unfounded meant, he felt that the case was not sustained. Ms. Gallager-Smith agreed with not sustained.

Ms. Conover wanted to take a minute to explain her reasoning for saying unfounded. She agreed that the person made the complaint, but that based off the conversation with the manager thought that the issue was within the business and not with the police.

- Additional Comments/Concerns

Ms. Foltz stated again that she was uncomfortable with the repeated comments about business owners not wanting to jeopardize their relationship with the police. She was also interested in looking more at the smoking ban, since she believed that it led to more of these types of interactions. Ms. Foltz wanted to know how many citations had been given so far, and if they ever ended in arrests.

Mr. Hames-Garcia thought that the case was an excellent example of the smoking ban issue. He was glad that they looked at this case, since retaliation complaints were so rare.

Ms. Gallagher-Smith stated that these issues would continue since the imbalance of power between citizens and police would always be a problem.

Mr. Al-Rawe noted that the reporting person was described as having a threatening appearance. He emphasized that they should not use appearance in determining if someone was a threat.

6. Break

The CRB took a break from 6:43 p.m. - 6:55 p.m.

7. Demographics of Officer-Initiated Police Contacts

Ron Tinseth, an EPD lieutenant, introduced himself and said that he would be speaking to the CRB about the overview of EPD in the state report. He said that unlike other agencies they captured 100% of their stops and reported more on pedestrians than the state required. Mr. Tinseth explained that that might be because Eugene had a higher pedestrian stop rate.

As a general overview 86% of people stopped were White, 5.7% were Black, 2.4% were Asian/Pacific Islander, and .4% were Native American. They also had break downs of the ages, genders, stop days/weeks, and the reasons for stops.

Mr. Tinseth started talking about the Veil of Darkness test, which reported on the dip in stops based on the time of day and when the sun was setting. Along with it they measured if the officer knew the ethnicity before the stop. He stated that there was no statistically significant data for Black and Hispanic individuals. Ms. Foltz pointed out that the type of car someone was driving could be used to make assumptions.

Next Mr. Tinseth wanted to talk about predicted disposition, which detailed what happened when someone was stopped. There was no evidence of disparity for Black and Hispanic people. Ms. Foltz pointed out that in the main document the report used dashes in place of data, which seemed to indicate that there was not enough data which did not mean there was no disparity. Mr. Gissiner told her that the dashes were under the predicted numbers.

Mr. Tinseth said that they treated hit-rates differently for searches and that there was no statistically significant evidence for Black and Hispanic people. He noted that they had low numbers for that data.

Mr. Roseta asked how much time it took for an officer to make a report. Mr. Tinseth replied that it was usually around thirty seconds, but it could take longer. He mentioned that motor teams had tablets, but those sometimes had issues connecting to the internet so those officers would write their reports later. Ms. Foltz questioned how they would remember all the information they needed. Mr. Tinseth responded that the information was pretty basic, but officers could always email themselves information or write it down. Ms. Williams wanted to know what motor team was. Mr. Tinseth replied that they were traffic enforcement officers on motorcycles. Mr. Tinseth added that the data had information on all stops if someone wanted to see it broken down more.

Mr. Tinseth said that there were 11,136 total stops in 2018. He added that there would be another report on 2019 that would be released around the same time next year. The 2019 reports would have all tier two and below police departments in Oregon, and the 2020 reports would have all police departments. Ms. Conover asked if the 2020 reports would include sheriffs. Mr. Tinseth answered that they would. Ms. Conover asked if the 2020 reports would include tribal police. Mr. Tinseth replied that he was unsure, but he did not think they would be.

Mr. Gissiner asked if changes in the 2020 legislative short session would impact them in anyway. Mr. Tinseth did not think they would be affected.

Mr. Tinseth told the CRB that he looked at the data almost every day and that there was built in accountability. If a report was not turned in, it would go up the chain of command until it was either turned in or at the top of the chain of command. Ms. Foltz was glad to hear that filing reports was a priority and that the chain of command was adamant about them getting done.

Mr. Tinseth voiced that this data process was common across the United States and that they were catching up with everyone. He also pointed out that EPD had recently hired sixty new cops. Understanding this process and filing reports quickly will be just another part of the job for any new hires.

Mr. Gissiner asked if they tried to find states that had a similar make up to Oregon and looked at their demographics. Mr. Tinseth replied that Kansas and Nebraska were similar to them, but neither of them were doing as much as they were in Oregon.

Before leaving Mr. Tinseth wanted to say that concerning state-wide data they were not expecting to capture 100% of stops.

8. Auditor Report

Mr. Gissiner said that in 2019 they had four hundred and forty-six complaints. They were currently working on putting together the annual report.

9. Adjourn

Ms. Foltz adjourned the meeting at 7:41 p.m.

(Minutes recorded by Lydia Dysart)

Eugene Police Department

January 2020 Open Case Report

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Jan 2, 2020
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP reported a Crime Prevention vehicle that did 2 U-turns at a busy intersection. RP didn't want other drivers to get the impression that this was a safe thing to do. There does not appear to be a law-enforcement reason for the U-turns.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Jan 2, 2020
Class/sub-class: Inquiry /
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP is concerned about a search warrant that was conducted on her home over a bicycle. RP stated that officers interrupted her early in the morning, searched her house and then asked her about her son. Her son lives in their travel trailer on the property, the officer then went and got her son, brought him back in handcuffs, this is when she was finally shown the warrant. RP's son was questioned for a couple of hours and finally released, with the officers taking his cell phone. They then learned that one of the officers broke a pipe in the travel trailer leaving water to run for over 2 hours before it was discovered. No one bothered to tell them about the pipe. The incident has frightened her and her husband and was total overkill for the issue of a stolen bike.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Jan 3, 2020
Class/sub-class: Inquiry /
Disposition: Dismissed-alt remedy

RP was confused by officers showing up at her home at 0138, 10 hours after she had an incident in which a store employee had come to her home to retrieve a TV. The man showed up while she was dressing and through her bedroom window (which has a broken blind) she asked him to come back later so she could dress. The man continued to stand there and refused to leave. RP finally told the man she would get her gun and proceeded to show it to him while still in it's case. The officers arrived 10 hours later, waking her, and proceeded to cite her for harassment.

Dismiss - alternate remedy.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Jan 6, 2020
Class/sub-class: Inquiry /
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP inquired into why an EPD SUV drove by her turned around and drove by her again 4 times and then parked and watched her. RP is anxious of the police and felt harassed by the officer's behavior.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Jan 6, 2020
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance
Disposition:

RP reported an officer who had responded to his apartment complex about a woman complaining of being molested. The officer did a great job of looking into the issue and understanding the underlying issues. After the officer spoke with the woman he came and spoke with RP, then told him he was going to speak with the other tenants, instead he went straight to his car to leave. When RP questioned the officer about leaving before talking with anyone else the officer became upset, then said something about getting another call. RP feels the officer did not treat him with dignity.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Jan 7, 2020
Class/sub-class: Policy Complaint /
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP wrote to the chief concerning an incident in 2018 in which she alleges she was injured and suffered a traumatic brain injury due to police treatment. RP requests that EPD implement training for assessing situations more appropriately and more care in choosing lesser intensity of use of force to prevent citizen injuries.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Jan 8, 2020
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Service level
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP reported to EPD in September of 2019 a cologne bottle that was stolen by his caretaker. About a month later RP spoke with the officer who took his report, who told him that he had not yet spoken with the suspect and he would call RP back when he found out more. Even though RP has left messages the officer has not called him back.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Jan 8, 2020
Class/sub-class: Inquiry /
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP reported a situation that frustrated him greatly. RP has been living in the same home for over 2 years and has had a neighbor continually call EPD about where he parks his truck at night. The vehicle is moved daily as he goes to work. RP has spoken with EPD officers 3 or 4 times who have told him due to the street having no curbs, sidewalks and no parking restriction signs his parking is fine. RP's truck was towed this morning and he received different information from the officer who was present. RP was also upset that he received a parking citation.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Jan 9, 2020
Class/sub-class: Inquiry /
Disposition: Dismissed-o/s jurisdic

RP reported an incident in which he called in a welfare check on a woman who was freezing outside. CAHOOTS and medics were unable to get the woman to accept help and then an appeared to use force with her, which RP felt was totally uncalled for and wrong.
Dismissed - Outside Jurisdiction

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Jan 14, 2020
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Service level
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP inquired into if all calls to the call center are recorded and then can be pulled up by the caller's name or phone number. RP has made 4 calls to EPD in reference an incident in October. RP was told by a call taker that only two of the calls were showing.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Jan 16, 2020
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance
Disposition:

RP wrote Chief Skinner with a concern and suggestion about customer service at EPD. RP's wife had been in a hit and run recently and even though witnesses were able to provide the plate number and basic description of the suspect the investigation was done so poorly it will never be prosecuted. The officer also never called RP back to provide information about the case. RP suggested that officers be required to contact the victim with the disposition of the case even if no arrest can be made. Also disposition reports should list the steps taken during the case, so a supervisor can determine if all investigative steps were taken.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Jan 17, 2020
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP stopped by the Auditor's Office concerned that a police report was never filed following an incident between the RP's son and RP's ex-wife's boyfriend. RP has tried to check in with the officer a couple of times since the incident and gets no return call. RP's son had visible injuries following the incident, but the officer in charge did not speak with RP's and decided that no crime had occurred. The solution was for him to remove his son from the residence. RP feels that the incident was assault and battery on his son and no complete follow up was done.

Incident type: Incident Review
Status: Active
Received date: Jan 18, 2020
Class/sub-class: Incident Review / Performance
Disposition:

RPs submitted a complaint concerning a supervisor's performance, demeanor and conduct at the 911 Communications Center, alleging that the supervisor "interjected [himself/herself] in an aggressive and erratic manner that was disruptive to communications center operations" during a Springfield Police pursuit entering Eugene.

Incident type: IA Investigation
Status: Active
Received date: Jan 20, 2020
Class/sub-class: Allegation of Misconduct / Performance
Disposition:

A supervisor reported that s/he had discovered that an officer had failed to properly and promptly book evidence at the Evidence Control Unit.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Jan 21, 2020
Class/sub-class: Inquiry /
Disposition:

RP is concerned that various police agencies including EPD keep showing up at his place of work or home demanding his phone number. RP has to register as a sex offender which he does as required with OSP. All his information is on the form he fills out with them. RP believes this is a scam and the police are just harassing him

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Jan 22, 2020
Class/sub-class: Inquiry /
Disposition: Dismissed-alt remedy

RP reported an EPD officer who failed to follow the law when he cited him for speeding. EPD policy states that officers must follow state and federal laws as well as EPD policy. RP feels that the officer was not doing this. RP noted that the officer had his vehicle blacked out while sitting at a stop sign, and was not visible from within the required amount of feet per ORS.

Dismiss. Alternate remedy.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Jan 23, 2020
Class/sub-class: Inquiry /
Disposition: Dismissed-Other

RP witnessed an interaction between an officer and a bicyclist outside her home. After flipping his siren at the bicyclist a couple of times to get her attention the officer questioned her about why she didn't stop for the light. After the ID exchange the officer ran the girl's name and told her that she had warrants, which freaked the girl because she didn't have a reason for having a warrant. But then it turned out she didn't have a warrant. When the girl went to leave, the officer ran a few steps, grabbed the back wheel of the bike and flipped the girl forward on her bike. RP doesn't believe she was hurt. RP feels the whole situation wasn't necessary.

Auditor requests review of the BWV.

Dismiss - Auditor. Based on body worn, officer had reasonable suspicion to detain for running a red light. officer never said she had a warrant, only said he was checking. As he was checking she tried to leave and he gently grabbed her back pack to stop her. He said she could not leave until he checked her for warrants. After he checked, he told her she could leave.

No policy violation. Dismiss per Auditor.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Jan 23, 2020
Class/sub-class: Inquiry /
Disposition: Dismissed-Other

RP stopped by the Auditor's Office frustrated that every time he tries to obtain help from law enforcement concerning the people who are using his phone to send signals to his brain, nothing is done. The issue has been going on for years and law enforcement continues to allow this to take place, whoever is behind this is trying to make him look insane.
Dismiss by Auditor - other.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Jan 24, 2020
Class/sub-class: Inquiry /
Disposition: Dismissed-Other

RP filed a report about the FED's monitoring his movements and seeing the things people do to him, they do nothing but when he fights back the cops (EPD) jump in to "Uphold the law". RP also complained about monsters involved in these incidents.

No further action. Dismiss per Auditor.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Jan 24, 2020
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Use of Force
Disposition:

An EPD supervisor was contacted by RP at the front counter of headquarters. RP stated he was contacted and detained by an officer who he believed used excessive force to detain him and cause injury to his left arm. RP displayed a bruise on his left forearm. The supervisor took photos of the injury. This intake was recorded by BWC.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Jan 24, 2020
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Use of Force
Disposition:

An EPD supervisor contacted RP, who stated she was contacted by an officer who she believes used excessive force during her arrest. She stated she was not injured. The intake was captured on BWC.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Jan 28, 2020
Class/sub-class: Inquiry /
Disposition: Dismissed-Timeliness

RP reported an incident in which he feels he was wrongly arrested by an officer, for accidentally getting ash from his cannabis pipe on an officer during a person stop. The City Prosecutor finally dropped the charges and RP feels the officer must be disciplined for his abuse of power.

Dismissed - Timeliness.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Jan 29, 2020
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance
Disposition: Dismissed-prev reviewed

RP, after reviewing an article about Eugene Animal Control, wrote to Chief Skinner about his concerns about the unprofessional treatment he felt he received when he had an issue with a dog bite in 2018. RP has filed complaints about the same treatment two other times previously.

Dismissed. Previously reviewed.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Jan 29, 2020
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance
Disposition:

RP reported an EPD vehicle that was driving erratically. The driver ran a red light and turned in front of RP without a signal. The driver had also been driving slower than the posted speed and driving without headlights in the rain.

Incident type: Auditor Intake
Status: Initial
Received date: Jan 29, 2020
Class/sub-class: Incident Review / Performance
Disposition:

RP came to the Auditor's Office to discuss concerns she had surrounding an interaction with the downtown team and a supervisor's follow-up to that interaction. The complaint centered around the following:

- 1) the supervisor contacting a County worker to talk about another County worker; and
- 2) The alleged language used indicates a lack of awareness surrounding racial biases and an inability to constructively discuss race and bias.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Jan 30, 2020
Class/sub-class: Policy Complaint /
Disposition: Dismissed-Other

An Anonymous male contacted the Auditor's Office upset with how EPD officers will block the exit-entrance to 7-11's while conducting investigations.

Per Auditor - OK to close. Dismissed - Other

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Jan 31, 2020
Class/sub-class: Inquiry /
Disposition: Dismissed-Timeliness

RP reported an incident in 2013 in which he alleges an EPD detective obstructed justice by manipulating evidence and falsely swearing to that evidence on arrest warrants.

Per Auditor: Dismissed - Timeliness

[27 incidents displayed.](#)

Report created on: 02/05/2020 at: 14:59 By: Sr Prg Coord Vicki Cox

Eugene Police Department

January 2020 Closed Case Report

Incident type: IA Investigation
Status: Completed
Received date: Aug 7, 2019
Class/sub-class: Allegation of Misconduct / Performance
Disposition: Sustained

1. 814 Pursuit Policy - It is alleged that an officer initiated and conducted a vehicle pursuit in violation of policy.
2. 103.5.14 Unsatisfactory Performance - It is alleged that an officer, while performing the duties of a Field Training Officer, failed to take appropriate action when his recruit initiated a pursuit of a vehicle which did not meet the criteria outlined in 814 Pursuit Policy.

Allegations:

Performance - 103.5.14 Unsatisfactory Performance - Sustained - Oct 10, 2019

Performance - 814 Vehicle Pursuit Policy - Sustained - Oct 10, 2019

Incident type: IA Investigation
Status: Completed
Received date: Aug 30, 2019
Class/sub-class: Allegation of Criminal Conduct / Conformance to Laws
Disposition: Unfounded

RP in a tip to the Sheriff's Office generic email box alleged that a prostitute has been providing services to a member of the EPD sex crimes division. RP, who is the sister of the woman continues in her email with concerns about the welfare of her niece and nephews. RP asks to remain anonymous but provides a phone number for contact.

Following criminal investigation, no EPD employee identified; Unfounded.

Report created on: 02/05/2020 at: 15:01 By: Sr Prg Coord Vicki Cox

Police Commendations

The Eugene Police Department Commendations from citizens for January 2020 maybe found at the link below.

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