



## 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.*

### Civilian Review Board Meeting Agenda

Tuesday, June 9, 2020 – 5:30pm

Via Webinar: <https://zoom.us/j/99888433924>

Webinar ID: 998 8843 3924

Password: 787212

Or join by phone:

Dial (for higher quality, dial a number based on your current location):

(669) 900 6833

(253) 215 8782

(346) 248 7799

(929) 205 6099

(301) 715 8592

(312) 626 6799

<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 March meeting)	5 minutes (5:40pm)
4. Comments from Board Members and Commission Liaisons	15 minutes (5:45pm)
5. Case Review: Incident Reviews: Pursuit Response, Taser Use, Treatment of Arrestee	45 minutes (6:00pm)
6. Auditor Report	25 minutes (6:45pm)
7. Closing Comments	10 minutes (7:10pm)
8. Adjourn – Next Meeting July 14, 2020	(7:20pm)

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

March 10, 2020  
5:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Lindsey Foltz, Rick Roseta, Bernadette Conover, Awab Al-Rawe, Michael Hames-Garcia, Civilian Review Board members; Beatrice Hernandez, Leia Pitcher, Vicki Cox, Mark Gissiner, Police Auditor's Office; Jason Berreth, Curtis Newell, Eugene Police Department; Ela Kubok, Human Rights Commission.

ABSENT: Carolyn Williams, Susan Gallagher-Smith, Civilian Review Board members.

Chair Lindsey Foltz convened the Civilian Review Board (CRB) at 5:33 p.m.

**1. Agenda and Materials Review**

There were no changes made to the agenda.

**2. Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

**3. Minutes Approval**

Ms. Conover moved, seconded by Mr. Roseta, to approve the February 11, 2020 CRB minutes. The motion passed unanimously.

**4. Comments from Board Members and Commission Liaisons**

Ms. Foltz liked the process that they started using last meeting where after everyone spoke the floor opened for second comments.

Mr. Hames-Garcia was curious as to how cases were picked to come in front of them. Ms. Foltz told him that the chair met with the auditor's office monthly to pick one. They also took suggestions from CRB members. Ms. Conover added that they were given the closed cases monthly and could request they talk about one if interested. Ms. Foltz said that they also can access the open cases at any time.

Mr. Gissiner mentioned that body cameras changed a lot of the process. They now have film to show if officers were acting in line and any misconduct resulting in an investigation. Ms. Foltz noted that they had reviewed unfounded cases in the past and wanted to know if prescreened videos were not put in that pool. Mr. Gissiner said that was correct. Ms. Conover asked if they were included in the yearly complaint review. Mr. Gissiner replied that they had talked about doing that but said they only interviewed officers if there was an allegation made.

Mr. Hames-Garcia shared that at the Human Rights Commission EPD talked about biased crimes. They were changing how they were done. He said that they were reporting them less frequently, on a quarterly basis, so they could notice trends.

Ms. Foltz shared that at the Police Commission meeting they brought in the dogs and talked about their training process. She thought it was helpful to hear how dog training had changed. One change was that they were being taught to bite with their back teeth to cause less harm.

Ms. Pitcher said that they had four bite dogs and one drug dog being trained. Mr. Berreth clarified that they were tracking dogs, not biting dogs. Their job was to search for people or items. Ms. Foltz noted that dogs could change how interactions play out and could potentially make them safer.

Ms. Kubok from the Human Rights Commission missed the last Human Rights Commission but informed everyone that their next meeting would be March 17, 2020. Mr. Hames-Garcia remembered that at the meeting they also talked about the unhoused population in Eugene. There was a lot of data on the topic. Seniors were their fastest growing unhoused population and discussed how a lot of people got stuck paying fines. Citations were usually mailed so this put the unhoused in trouble because they had no way to receive them.

Ms. Foltz said that since their training topic presenter was not there they would start their case review.

## **5. Case Review: Allegation of Improper Response to Child Abuse Call**

Ms. Pitcher presented a slideshow entitled “Case Summary: Civilian Review Board, March 10, 2020”.

### **I. Summary of Facts**

- Officer A was dispatched to a report of a young teenager who had broken a window of her house and was in a verbal dispute with her mother.
- Officer A contacted the juvenile outside of the home. The juvenile stated that her mom had been physical with her (for example, hitting her and slamming her against the wall). She also stated that she wanted to go to Station 7, and that she had wanted to go there before anything had happened at home.
- Officer A then talked to the parents. Officer A did not ask about any physical contact between the parents and the juvenile.
- The mother made a statement to Officer A that she suspected the juvenile may be pregnant as a result of a sexual assault that occurred two weeks ago. Officer A did not ask about that incident.
- The mother requested that the juvenile be taken to Serbu on criminal mischief charges (for breaking the window). Officer A responded that Serbu would not take the juvenile, and would just send her back home.
- The mother indicated that she did not want the juvenile to go the Station 7 because she was involved in a sexual relationship with an older juvenile who was staying there.
- Officer A did not ask about the sexual relationship (which, if true, would meet the definition of statutory rape).
- CAHOOTS arrived on scene, and one of the CAHOOTS employees retrieved clothing from the juvenile’s home. The employee informed Officer A that the mother believed the juvenile was being taken to Serbu. Officer A arranged for CAHOOTS to take her to Station 7.
- Officer A told the juvenile that the report would be forwarded to DHS so that they could look into her allegations.
- Officer A reported the incident as a “Criminal Mischief” and did not indicate in the report where the juvenile was taken or that her mother objected to her going there.
- The complaint was internally reported by an EPD supervisor.
- Officer A stated in their administrative interview that they did not believe they had violated any EPD policies.

### **II. Allegations**

1. **330.3 Child Abuse Reporting:** That Officer A failed to report as required by statute, investigate, or document in a report that the mother of the juvenile reported that she had been sexually assaulted, and/or that she had had a sexual relationship with someone four years older (which would violate Oregon law).

2. **103.4.3 Integrity:** That Officer A arranged for the juvenile to be taken by CAHOOTS to Station 7 even though the juvenile's mother objected and wanted her transported to Serbu; that Officer A knowingly left the mother with the impression that the juvenile would be taken to Serbu
3. **103.4 Judgment:** That Officer A failed to report, investigate, or document in a report that the mother of the juvenile stated that the juvenile had been sexually assaulted, or that the mother had stated that the juvenile had had a sexual relationship with someone four years older.
4. **103.5.22 Report and Evidence Submission:** That Officer A's report omitted relevant facts, for example:
  - That the mother stated her daughter was possibly pregnant from a sexual assault
  - That the mother stated her daughter was in a sexual relationship with someone four years older
  - The disposition or location of the juvenile at the end of the contact
  - That the juvenile was transported by CAHOOTS to Station 7 despite her mother's objections
5. **103.5.14 Unsatisfactory Performance:** That Officer A failed to perform the required tasks of her rank and position by not investigating allegations made by the juvenile that her mother had physically assaulted her.

### III. Adjudications

1. Child Abuse Reporting
  - EPD chain of command recommendation: Sustained
  - Auditor's Office recommendation: Sustained
  - Chief of Police: Sustained
2. Integrity
  - EPD chain of command recommendation: Sustained
  - Auditor's Office recommendation: Sustained
  - Chief of Police: Sustained
3. Judgment
  - EPD chain of command recommendation: Sustained
  - Auditor's Office recommendation: Sustained
  - Chief of Police: Sustained
4. Report and Evidence Submission
  - EPD chain of command recommendation: Sustained
  - Auditor's Office recommendation: Sustained
  - Chief of Police: Sustained
5. Unsatisfactory Performance
  - EPD chain of command recommendation: Sustained
  - Auditor's Office recommendation: Sustained
  - Chief of Police: Sustained

### IV. Issues for CRB Discussion

- Complaint Intake and Classification
  - Internally reported complaint
  - Classification: Allegation of Misconduct

Ms. Foltz asked if anyone had any biases. No one did.

Ms. Conover noted that there were a bunch of holes in the officer's report. She said that was done poorly but the intake was great. Mr. Roseta and Mr. Hames-Garcia agreed that the report was unfocused but that everything else was good.

Mr. Al-Rawe asked if there was any allegation made against Officer B. Ms. Pitcher informed him that they had discussed it but assumed that they thought Officer A had filled out the report correctly. Mr. Al-Rawe thought that the back up officer also wrote their own report. Mr. Berreth told him that that was only done if the officer had other information. Mr. Al-Rawe was also concerned that neither officer reported the sexual abuse. Ms. Pitcher noted that Officer B believed that Officer A had reported it to DHS. Mr. Al-Rawe mentioned that Officer B heard about the sexual encounter from the juvenile, while Officer A heard it from the mom. This meant that they had different information.

Ms. Foltz wanted to know how the case went to the Auditor's Office. She wanted to know how the supervisor heard about the incident. Ms. Pitcher responded that they were reviewing the body camera footage.

- Complaint Investigation and Monitoring

Mr. Roseta said that the investigation was great, as always, and moved quickly.

Mr. Al-Rawe noticed that in the investigation report it said that Officer A convinced CAHOOTS to go to SERBU, he assumed that was a mistake and should say Station 7. Ms. Pitcher said that was correct.

Ms. Foltz said that the report was thorough and well organized. Ms. Conover agreed and said that the investigation cleared up a lot about the incident.

Mr. Hames-Garcia asked if they talked to either CAHOOTS employees. Mr. Berreth told him that they interviewed one during the investigation but the other did not reply to their call. Ms. Foltz asked if CAHOOTS was under their jurisdiction. Ms. Pitcher informed her that they were not.

- Relevant Department Policies and Practices
  - 330 Child Abuse Reporting
  - 103 Code of Conduct
    - 103.4.3 Integrity
    - 103.4.1 Judgment
    - 103.5.22 Report and Evidence Submission
    - 103.5.14 Unsatisfactory Performance

Mr. Hames-Garcia was unclear on the integrity policy and thought it was a confusing situation. He sympathized with the officer because they were trying to get the juvenile where they thought was best. Mr. Hames-Garcia said that it was an unfortunate ruling with no good option.

Mr. Al-Rawe noted that in the interviews Officer A said that the mother did not know where the juvenile was going, which crossed the line. Mr. Hames-Garcia mentioned that the mother made it clear they were going to abandon the juvenile. Mr. Al-Rawe said that Officer A knew that parent would be unaware and told them that Serbu would turn the juvenile away. Ms. Pitcher stated that Officer A was unclear on what Serbu was. Mr. Berreth said that Serbu would never not let someone in and they would have kept the juvenile inside. They had made sure that all officers understood that. Ms. Foltz asked for them to receive more information on Serbu at a later date.

Ms. Foltz appreciated that both officers got down on their knees to look the juvenile in the face. They both remained calm and used appropriate language.

Ms. Conover felt that integrity was an appropriate policy for the situation. She said that Officer A put their agenda ahead of the parents. Ms. Conover felt that Serbu would have been a good choice for the juvenile. The workers were counselors and it was a safe place for them to decompress. Ms. Pitcher stated that the weight each person gave the mom's statement changed the situation. Mr. Hames-Garcia noted that later in the footage the mom was okay with the juvenile going to Station 7 after they went to Serbu, so it seemed like she did not really care.

Mr. Roseta agreed with Ms. Foltz that the officers acted well with the situation they walked into. He said that the integrity policy concerned him and that it started off with a communication failure and evolved from there. When Officer A lied to the mom Mr. Roseta believed it became an integrity issue.

- Policy and/or Training Considerations

Mr. Al-Rawe said that the only big issue was Officer A's report. Also he was concerned that the officers did not check or ask the juvenile if they had any injuries. Mr. Al-Rawe noted that CAHOOTS did. Officer B had asked the juvenile if they were hurt, but did not document that information. Ms. Foltz asked if an officer knows CAHOOTS will show up if they would wait for someone of the same sex to check on someone. Mr. Berreth replied that if there was no emergency that was the generally followed rule.

Ms. Foltz asked what the standard protocol for a rape allegation was. Mr. Berreth responded that an officer would be sent out to take a statement. Then if possible the victim would be examined for evidence, which would then be sent to violent crimes. Ms. Foltz inquired into if there was any difference between a juvenile and adult allegation. Mr. Berreth replied it depended on the age of the victim, but usually that only changed the routing of the case.

Mr. Hames-Garcia asked if the officer had the option to take the juvenile to a hospital. Mr. Berreth told him that people could always be taken to a hospital. Mr. Al-Rawe thought it would have made sense to take the juvenile to the hospital. Ms. Pitcher noted that the juvenile would have had to consent to going. Mr. Hames-Garcia stated that the juvenile was not even asked if they wanted to go to the hospital.

Ms. Conover liked how the officers talked to the juvenile. However, she was confused on if the child abuse or sexual assault was reported to DHS.

Mr. Roseta was dissatisfied with the report Officer A gave. It was written in a stream of consciousness way, which was confusing. He asked if there was a manual that outlined how to write a report. Mr. Berreth informed him that there was a manual that helped with formatting but there was no rule on the narration format.

- Adjudication Recommendations

Ms. Foltz, Ms. Conover, Mr. Roseta, Mr. Hames-Garcia, and Mr. Al-Rawe all agreed with all the adjudication recommendations.

- Additional Comments/Concerns

Ms. Conover said that there was a lot going on and it was a sad situation. She stated that there was no right way for things to have gone, just a better way. Ms. Foltz agreed and said that she was disappointed by the follow through for someone that was in distress.

## **6. Training Topic: Special Investigations Unit/Human Trafficking**

Detective Curtis Newell, from EPD's Special Investigations unit, approached the board to talk about human trafficking in Eugene. Special Investigations, alongside human trafficking dealt, with biased crimes, gang activity, and terrorist activity.

Mr. Newell said that when they saw prostitution it was typically not by choice or being done by a minor. He shared that EPD worked with local organizations to target those at risk of being trafficked. When dealing with these cases Mr. Newell said they looked at it through the eyes of the victim. While prostitution was illegally they recognized that it was usually not done by choice. Therefore their goal was not to arrest sex workers, but to help them. He explained that the main focus was on finding traffickers, recruiters, and those creating the demand. Mr. Newell said that there was a hierarchy to trafficking and that it was set up like a business. He emphasized that anyone could be involved in trafficking, there was no one specific type.

Ms. Conover asked if the business model was a new set up. Mr. Newell replied that while prostitution had been around for a long time, recently the model had changed. It used to be mainly street walkers, but the internet changed that. There are now internet platforms that were used. He mentioned that people involved knew exactly where to go.

Mr. Newell stated that there were other types of sex trafficking in the community. Sometimes homeless individuals had to do sexual actions in order to get food or shelter. In those cases there was no trafficker, just the individual.

Ms. Conover asked if sex workers were being brought into their community. Mr. Newell told her that most of the work in Eugene was home grown. However, there were organizations that moved around nearby areas and states. He noted that there were some national/abroad cases. Those fit more into the brothel model. Usually those girls were imported from China and went to a big city, like New York, before being shipped around the country.

Mr. Newell said that he had done some undercover work. He would research phone numbers and online ads before setting anything up a point of contact. Mr. Newell mentioned that the brothel model was more sophisticated and would sometimes have ads around the country.

Mr. Gissiner asked when dealing with juvenile cases if they had compared their numbers to those of states with a curfew. Mr. Newell responded that they had not done that. He found out through talking with victims that minors were usually runaways. In these cases it would be hard to say if a curfew would help, since there are no parents to set the rules.

Mr. Newell said the best way to form a case was by forming a relationship with the sex worker. Normally traffickers pit their workers against cops so they are scared to talk to them. However, EPD tried to stabilize the victim and get them what they were lacking.

Mr. Gissiner inquired into how the changes in drug laws for heroin and meth might have influenced sex trafficking numbers. Mr. Newell replied that it did not help but cannot say that it made things worse. He explained that substance abuse was usually involved, even before the changes. Sometimes workers were addicted before they started and sometimes traffickers got their workers addicted. Mr. Newell noted that there were definitely cases where there were no drugs involved.

Mr. Roseta wanted to know if they had a relationship with the FBI if cases went out of state. Mr. Newell responded that they had worked with the FBI and US Attorney's Office. They were contacted depending on the crimes or location or the trafficking.

Mr. Newell shared that they preferred to close cases outside of court. They tried to keep the victim's best interest at heart.

Mr. Hames-Garcia wanted to know how many people in the Special Investigations unit were dedicated to sex trafficking. Mr. Newell was unsure of the number. He explained that they all worked on different types of cases.

The board thanked Mr. Newell for coming to talk to them.

### **7. Auditor Report**

Mr. Gissiner said that he and Ms. Pitcher would be out of town for the May 12, 2020 CRB meeting. He would also be out for the June meeting. Mr. Gissiner said that they would look at their schedule in April.

Mr. Gissiner stated that he got more information on a shooting that happened in the Arcadia area. He would share that with the board. Ms. Foltz asked what transparency he had with the IDFIT investigation. Mr. Gissiner replied that he did not have much with IDFIT but once at EPD he could see everything that those on the board could. Ms. Foltz asked when the case would close. Mr. Gissiner told her it would probably be over by the end of March.

Mr. Gissiner noted that they had a decrease in complaints from where they were at this point last year.

### **8. Closing Comments**

There were no closing comments.

### **9. Adjourn – Next Meeting April 14, 2020**

Ms. Foltz adjourned the meeting at 7:26 p.m.

*(Minutes recorded by Lydia Dysart)*



## Eugene Police Department

### March 2020 Open Case Report

---

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

Three separate people contacted the Auditor's Office regarding an incident at the airport.

An elderly person had come around to the terminal to pick up their partner who put their carry on into the car and went inside to get their bag. A security guard summoned an officer, who belligerently told RP they could not park there. RP circled around again and parked with the nose of the car in the crosswalk and began to get out of the car to help their partner. The officer yelled at RP to stay in the car as RP was being cited for being in the crosswalk. RP stated it was ridiculous how they were treated by the officer.

Each of the independent callers were upset and concerned about how the elderly couple was treated by a police officer and expressed wishes to hear back from a supervisor.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Mar 3, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance  
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP reported an officer who went through a 'do not enter' sign in their neighborhood. It did not appear that the officer was going to a call or doing official business. The neighborhood worked hard to get the traffic calming sign that keeps people from turning into the area.

---

Incident type: Incident Review  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Mar 7, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Incident Review / Performance  
Disposition: Dismissed-Other

An anonymous person alleged that an officer assaulted them while the officer was intoxicated or on drugs. The officer seemed incredibly aggressive and to unlawfully exert authority. No date, time, or further details were provided on the complaint form.

Dismiss per Deputy Auditor - insufficient details to investigate.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: Mar 9, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Service level  
Disposition:

RP is concerned that only Fire was dispatched when they reported a transient with an open fire under the awning of a property they own. Fire put out the flames and had the man move along. A no trespassing sign was on display below the man and RP wants to know why no officer was dispatched to cite the trespasser, as the property could have burned down.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Mar 11, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Inquiry  
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP reported an incident in which an officer had been coming to their daughter's door on two separate occasions at midnight. RP is unhappy with the time that officer had shown up due to safety issues with young girls opening their doors at that time of night. RP's daughter had recently broken up with a boyfriend and the issue seemed to be involving that. On the second occasion the officer showed up, RP's daughter told the officer she would meet with the officer at the police station with her lawyer to answer questions. The officer became irritated and said "Nope, I'm arresting you", giving her the excuse that the boy was pestering him to make an arrest. RP's daughter was arrested for criminal mischief 2.

Arrest: Alternative remedy.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Mar 12, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Courtesy  
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP reported an incident in which an officer who came to their door for a noise complaint seemed to be trying to escalate the incident, and when s/he asked for the officer's name, the officer was rude and turned their back without providing a name.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Mar 12, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Service level  
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP was concerned that when s/he called 911 about a naked man standing and yelling on their front porch, s/he was told "We'll try and get help to you". 30 minutes later the man was still there and when s/he called again s/he was told "There's 15 calls ahead of you". RP didn't believe the call taker was very sympathetic to their concern as s/he has PTSD and didn't know what the man was going to do.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Mar 13, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Inquiry  
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP alleges that officers violated their rights when s/he was not allowed to decline medical assistance for a gunshot wound. RP was restrained to a gurney and given Ketamine. RP also believes s/he was struck several times during the encounter. RP further alleges that their vehicle was searched without their permission or a warrant.

Dismiss. Falls under community care taking as RP attempted to commit suicide.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Mar 16, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Inquiry  
Disposition: Dismissed-Other

RP reported that when they were arrested, they had \$800 from selling their car, and an officer laughed at them, and accused them of selling drugs. The officer then illegally seized their phone without a warrant. When RP asked the officer what "RAS" he had to take the phone, he laughed and said, "we've

got a lawyer", slammed the door and took the phone. RP feels this officer is targeting them because they are holding them accountable for their tyrannical behavior.

Dismiss per Auditor. Vehicle identified as being involved in a shooting. Phones taken pending request for a search warrant. Will be returned if warrant not obtained.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Mar 16, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance  
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP reported an officer who threatened them 3 times with going to jail when s/he called about their ex trying to take their child. The officer failed to read the paperwork s/he provided which provided for a 60-day notice before the other parent could have the child. The officer allowed the ex to take the 3-year-old child out of state. The officer also did not have body cam on which s/he knows is required.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Mar 18, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance  
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP reported an officer who hesitated a longer than normal amount of time after the light turned green at an intersection, then quickly accelerated coming within 2-3 feet of a pedestrian before stopping.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: Mar 19, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Disputed Facts  
Disposition:

RP reported an officer who pulled them over after following them for a mile. The reason the officer provided for pulling them over was because the license plate wasn't readable. RP feels they were given a made-up reason for being pulled over, violating their rights. Both RP and the officer looked at the plate and there was no violation. RP tried to get the officer's name but was admonished to back away from the officer due to safety concerns.

---

Incident type: Incident Review  
Status: Active  
Received date: Mar 20, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Incident Review / Discrimination  
Disposition:

An attorney contacted the Auditor's Office with a concern that his client was racially profiled during a traffic stop. His client was stopped at gun point by officers, pulled from his car, slammed to the ground and handcuffed for over 30 minutes with no explanation as to why he was being detained. He was told "You are being detained, that's all you need to know." Evidently officers mistook him for someone else, but this all happened before he was asked for his name, ID, or registration for a car that is in his name. His client at one point asked for his handcuffs to be loosened, and was told, "If you check out, it will be over soon." The cuffs were not taken off for another 10 minutes when he was given 3 citations and released.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: Mar 20, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Inquiry  
Disposition:

RP reported an EPD officer who was clearly going home and not on a call, talking on his cell phone while driving down I5.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Mar 21, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance  
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP requested to speak to a supervisor after someone had violated a restraining order. RP claims officers were not truthful in their reports and did not interview all witnesses.

---

Incident type: IA Investigation  
Status: Active  
Received date: Mar 23, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Allegation of Misconduct / Use of Force  
Disposition:

Allegation:

800 Use of Force: It is alleged that an officer's use of force during the arrest of a subject for Disorderly Conduct and Criminal Trespass was outside policy.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Mar 23, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance  
Disposition: Dismissed-EE Not Identif

RP reported an EPD officer in an SUV who was on a cell phone and failed to signal his turn.

Dismissed - Employee Not Identifiable.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Mar 23, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance  
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP is confused with an officer's comment during a call for service in which a drunk semi-violent neighbor was harassing RP in their home. The neighbor was bashing on RP's door, and poured red paint on RP's windows. When officers finally arrived the officer's comment to RP was "In a perfect world what would you have me do?" To RP this was not helpful and confusing. The officer spoke with the neighbor, but as far as RP knows, was not cited for the vandalism and harassment.

---

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

RP is concerned about his daughter who has been pulled over twice recently on her way home from work at 2330. Both times officers have pulled her over, they have approached the car without identifying themselves and shone a flashlight into her face. RP's daughter is a young woman alone at night and has no way of knowing if they are legitimate. The first stop was LCSO, the second was EPD. Once the officer found it was a woman in the vehicle, they didn't even ask for ID and sent her on her way with no explanation for the stop. RP is also concerned that these stops at night are illegal fishing

stops without probable cause.

Dismiss per Auditor after review of in car camera and body worn camera. Initial stop was for tailgating and the officer could not read the license plate. The stop took less than 30 seconds as he did advise her why he was stopping her. Video showed that a reasonable officer would find probable cause to stop her for following too closely.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: Mar 25, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance  
Disposition:

RP inquired into how EPD handled a case of theft from RP's home. RP made a report of theft from a worker in their home. About a month later, RP learned that the man had been picked up on a parole violation. As far as RP can discern, RP's report was never linked to the man and followed up on. In early February RP spoke with the supervisor at the downtown station with a hint at where the man might be. The supervisor seemed uninterested and said the police would have a better idea than him. At this point RP feels like they have been ignored and would like this investigated.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: Mar 27, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Inquiry  
Disposition:

RP is concerned about the way a welfare check on them was handled in February. RP's partner thought they heard RP's shotgun in the background and called police. At least 7 cops showed up, one hiding behind a tree with binoculars. The other officers were holding their M4's in their hands. RP repeatedly told them they were fine, not suicidal and to leave. As one lady officer continued to question RP, RP looked to their left and noticed another officer with his gun pointed right at RP. Finally, a supervisor told the others they could leave.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: Mar 27, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance  
Disposition:

RP reported an unmarked vehicle that ran right through a red light at 7th and Madison, with no lights or sirens. Two other civilian vehicles followed him right through the light.

---

Incident type: Incident Review  
Status: Active  
Received date: Mar 31, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Incident Review / Use of Force  
Disposition:

Incident review into the use of force by several officers during the arrest of a noncompliant subject.

**23 incidents displayed.**

## Eugene Police Department

### April 2020 Closed Case Report

---

Incident type: IA Investigation  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Nov 15, 2019  
Class/sub-class: Allegation of Misconduct / Conduct  
Disposition: Resigned during Investigation

#### **Allegations:**

1. 103.5.14 Unsatisfactory Performance: That an EPD staff member did not adequately perform the tasks associated with their official position when they released their work material (the iINPUT software report) to an outside agency prior to the completion of the Technical Review (TR) in violation of FEU policy.
2. 103.5.14 Unsatisfactory Performance: That an EPD staff member did not adequately perform the tasks associated with their official position related to their work on this case, including:
  - (a) failing to document their work product related to images;
  - (b) failing to retain or preserve the images that were processed as evidence;
  - (c) failing to report and document the opinion that was offered in trial based on work performed;
  - (d) failing to document work as completed throughout the process as required by policy.
3. 103.5.1 Truthfulness: That an EPD staff member was not truthful when they told other EPD staff that they had not testified and that they were to testify in the future.
4. 103.5.17 Insubordination: That an EPD staff member was insubordinate when they testified after being instructed by a supervisor that they could not testify due to work issues discovered in the TR.
5. 103.4.3 Integrity: That an EPD staff member engaged in conduct that compromised their honesty and that of the department when they testified in this matter despite knowing that their work did not comply with FEU policies and that the TR identified work issues yet to be corrected.
6. 103.5.1 Truthfulness: That an EPD staff member was not truthful when they told other EPD staff that the only documentation released to an outside agency was the iINPUT report.
7. 103.4.3 Integrity - That an EPD staff member improperly deleted a large volume of computer files in close proximity in time to them being placed on Administrative Leave in connection with this investigation.

Employee resigned.

#### **Allegations:**

- Performance - 103.5.14 Unsatisfactory Performance - Resigned during investing
  - Performance - 103.5.14 Unsatisfactory Performance - Resigned during investing
  - Conduct - 103.5.1 Truthfulness - Resigned during investig
  - Conduct - 103.5.17 Insubordination - Resigned during investig
  - Conduct - 103.4.3 Integrity - Resigned during investig
  - Conduct - 103.5.1 Truthfulness - Resigned during investig
  - Conduct - 103.4.3 Integrity - Resigned during investig
- 

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

Policy reference: 1104.4.2 PROPERTY BOOKING PROCEDURE

All property must be booked into the Evidence Control Unit prior to the end of the submitting employee's shift. Property shall be submitted following the guidelines and recommendations detailed in the Eugene Police Department Packaging Manual.

**Allegation:**

1104 Evidence and Property Handling - It is alleged that an officer violated policy when they failed to book property into the Evidence Control Unit prior to the end of their shift.

---

2 incidents displayed.

## Eugene Police Department

### April 2020 Open Case Report

---

Incident type: IA Investigation  
Status: Active  
Received date: Apr 1, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Allegation of Misconduct / Performance  
Disposition:

Allegation:

1203.7 Body-Worn Video: That a supervisor muted their microphone in violation of policy during the contact and investigation of a use of force (Taser).

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Apr 4, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance  
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

Complainant called EPD's non-emergency line to report an incident with a trespasser at his apartment complex. He felt the call taker asked too many questions and inappropriately hung up on him. RP called back, spoke to a different call taker and eventually asked to speak to a supervisor.

Per Auditor - Service Complaint. Closed with supervisor response.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Apr 4, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Inquiry  
Disposition: Dismissed-alt remedy

RP was upset with the way he was arrested in June 2019, after a dispute with a relative he was asking to leave his home. Without a warrant, officers used flashbangs and swat officers leveled rifles at him. He then, unprovoked, was shot with a soft projectile.

Per Auditor - Dismissed - Alternate Remedy and timeliness.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: Apr 6, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Inquiry  
Disposition:

RP requested (via the HRC for accommodations) being able to speak with someone at EPD about various incidents reported, the labeling of the crimes, and what the outcome is. RP mentioned that possibly speaking with the officer who took the reports, or their Sergeant would help understand where each is at and how it was classified.

---

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



RP inquired into why nothing has been done about a sign theft he reported. RP had been able to give the plate of the person who took the sign and when he inquired into the outcome, he was given the incident number and told it was given to the beat officers. As far as he can tell no follow-up.

RP also asked to speak to someone about the options on the x5111 recording (he feels it should have an "Other" option as well as Reporting and Records) and was told he would have to call the Auditor to complain and could not be forwarded to the person responsible for the recording.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: Apr 7, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Inquiry  
Disposition:

RP, the mother of the young woman killed in a car accident, is concerned that she has been unable to get an officer to return her calls about the case.

---

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

RP expressed concern about the resources used: Patrol cars and motorcycles for a parade, escorting private vehicles for a 6-year old's birthday. RP was told by an officer that they had been given approval. In this time of emergency, RP wonders how his neighborhoods are being policed and resources spent. RP also noted a group of kids playing soccer at the school near where the parade was staging, and the blind eye turned to the group not following the distancing rules set up by the governor.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Apr 8, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Inquiry  
Disposition: Dismissed-Other

RP contacted the Auditor's Office with a concern about an incident at his home. RP and his 18-month-old child were in his garage with his dog, when suddenly two police officers appeared from around the corner of his house startling them. His dog began barking and running toward the officers, not even giving him a chance to grab the dog. One officer started beating him around the face with a mag light. The second officer, once the dog was cowering on the ground, stepped over and pepper sprayed the dog in the face. The officers then tried to tell him that a male DHS officer had called in a welfare check on RP's partner. RP called their partner's DHS worker to verify and learned that, as far as she knew, no one from DHS had made the call. RP is upset at the treatment of his dog by the officers and that no verification was made about the call that was supposedly DHS before officers were sent out.

Dismiss per Auditor after review of body worn video and reports. DHS did request a welfare check. The dog was loose and aggressive. The officers acted reasonably under the circumstances.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: Apr 10, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Inquiry  
Disposition:

RP is frustrated that an officer and a supervisor will not return his calls regarding an incident in which his daughter was arrested for felony assault. The man involved choked, bruised and gave his daughter a concussion, but was not charged. The DA did not go forward with charges and RP would like to discuss how this issue was handled, and his daughter would like to press charges against the man.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Apr 14, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Inquiry  
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP reported her son being arrested after calling in a suspect who was throwing rocks at a restaurant. Officers mistook him for someone else, threw him to the ground, hand cuffed him and failed to verify his identity (ID cards in his pocket). He was then jailed for 2 days without being able to call anyone or given his medication.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Apr 14, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Inquiry  
Disposition: Dismissed-Other

RP called the Auditor's Office to offer a couple of suggestions about the standoff on Westbrook Way on 4.13.20.

1. Sooner notification that a dangerous situation was going on, so people knew of the potential danger. RP heard the officers trying to get the man to put down his gun all afternoon, but no notification was given until 9pm.

2. In the phone notification it would be wise to remind people to not stand in front of windows, for their own safety.

Per Auditor - Dismissed - Other (Suggestions Only)

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: Apr 15, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance  
Disposition:

RP is concerned with how officers handled a call for service for a fire that was set outside of the front door of his business. (RP observed the interaction on his surveillance footage the next morning.)

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Apr 15, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Inquiry  
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP lives next door to the home involved in the standoff on Westbrook Way and would like to inquire into how the chain of events and the timing of police actions were determined. RP's family was asked to leave their home due to the situation but then allowed to return before it was over. RP felt overall the situation was handled well and is not complaining about officers, but for her peace of mind would like to ask some questions.

---

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

RP is upset with a couple of EPD officers who detained two suspects underneath his apartment window for 2 hours from 8 to 10 pm. The officers argued back and forth with them in loud enough voices as to disturb his evening routine and never took any action to solve the situation which appeared to be domestic in origin. RP noted that the officers seemed reluctant to put the suspects in their patrol car due to COVID19.

---

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

RP is concerned about the service she and her neighbors receive from EPD when they try and report issues. No one bothers to come out and take reports, only over the phone, and follow up on issues is very limited. RP's neighbor reported an attempted break in, he wants to press charges and RP has video from her ring device. The officer has failed to contact her to obtain the video. RP is frustrated with the service they receive.

---

Incident type: IA Investigation  
Status: Suspended  
Received date: Apr 17, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Allegation of Misconduct / Performance  
Disposition:

103.5.19 NEGLECT OF DUTY

a. Sleeping while on duty, is a neglect of duty, unless being done in accordance with an established policy or procedure. Should an employee find themselves having difficulty staying awake, they shall report to their supervisor for direction.

Allegation:

103.5.19 Neglect of Duty: It is alleged that an EPD staff member was sleeping on duty in violation of policy.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Apr 20, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Inquiry /  
Categories: LECC Reporting  
Disposition: Dismissed-Other

An officer requested a sergeant response to the Lane County Jail because a person in custody claimed he was racially profiled by officers and wrongfully arrested.

Dismissed per Auditor. Investigation revealed that officers were responding to a call for service - a robbery, and not officer initiated. Investigation by arresting officers led to the arrest of RP who matched the description of the robber and the victim's grandmother was able to track the stolen phone to RP's bunk at a shelter.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: Apr 21, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Courtesy  
Disposition:

RP reported an officer she felt was disrespectful toward her when she was making a report. RP noted that three officers came to take the report and one seemed to be in training. RP thought three officers was excessive for a theft report. RP also request she not be contacted but would like the interaction reviewed.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Apr 22, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Inquiry  
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP called EPD for a civil assist to take custody of his two children who had been on an extended stay with his ex. RP attempted to take custody, and his ex was not allowing it. RP is from another state and was able to show officers all his complete court paperwork showing he has custody of the children. The officers deemed a gray area in the extended time between Oregon and the other state and declined to help, insisting he needed to go back to court.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: Apr 22, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance  
Disposition:

RP emailed the Chief, unhappy with how a call for service was handled by EPD. The issue involved her daughter and a friend from school and her parents.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: Apr 23, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Inquiry  
Disposition:

It was reported that an officer may have reported for EPD Firearms training at the range, perhaps emitting an odor of an alcoholic beverage.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Completed  
Received date: Apr 23, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Inquiry /  
Disposition: Dismissed-o/s jurisdic

RP completed a complaint form outlining issues with a possible OSP officer. No mention of EPD employees was made.

Dismissed - Outside Jurisdiction

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: Apr 27, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance  
Disposition:

RP reported an incident in which he was waiting at a traffic light sometime between noon and 2 o'clock. An EPD officer was in front of him and failed to move for 10 seconds or longer after the light changed. RP tapped his horn to get the officer's attention which caused the officer to come out of their vehicle and threaten him with an unlawful use of a horn citation and lecture him on how rude he was for honking. RP did not lay on his horn and knows it is not unlawful to use your horn per a Supreme Court case he has read about.

---

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

RP claimed that the officer who was handling a theft RP had reported and had not returned his message in approximately 2 weeks. RP had questions on the progress of the investigation and felt the officer was ignoring him.

---

24 incidents displayed.

## Eugene Police Department

### May 2020 Open Case Reports

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Completed  
Received date: May 4, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Inquiry  
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP contacted the Auditor's Office alleging that officers entered the backyard of his property without probable cause or reasonable suspicion. RP shares this backyard with his neighbors and when he encountered officers with their holsters unclashed on his property, he was told officers noticed a lot of sketchy people and were doing a welfare check. RP called non-emergency to confirm whether anyone in the area had called about a welfare check, and he was told no one had called. When RP asked officers to leave the property, RP alleges one officer stated, "Hope you don't get hurt" and asked if he was going to post the interaction to Facebook. (RP is known to post many EPD-related incidents online). This led RP to believe officers knew about him, and were at his property to "show some muscle" and get back at him for previous videos he's posted.

Additionally, the following morning while on a walk at about 0800-0900 hours, RP claims a same officer from the day before was on 15th and Willamette and followed him all the way to 22nd & Alder. RP suspects intentional intimidation and feels unsafe.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: May 4, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance  
Disposition:

RP called the non-emergency number to report a transient had set up a major campsite in an outdoor alcove at her work. About an hour after she called, her landlord was able to get the transient to clear out. About that time, they noticed a police officer drive by the building along 12th Avenue. She called the non-emergency number back a little later to notify them an officer was no longer needed. The dispatcher said the officer had come by my building and didn't see anyone. Of course, he didn't see anyone, the location is not visible from the street nor from a passing vehicle! The officer didn't bother to stop and ask about the transient nor to check if he was still here. She thought this was an inadequate response to her concern.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: May 5, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Inquiry  
Disposition:

RP, reported an incident in which one of her members was approached by a female officer in the Skinner City Farm and accused of trespass and littering. The officer was angry and aggressive and used a scared child to translate instead of accessing an actual translator. The woman was actually in her garden plot gardening and to a logical person it would have seemed it was not a trespass situation. It appears the woman was called in by a third party. RP would like body cam reviewed.

---

Incident type: IA Investigation  
Status: Active  
Received date: May 5, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Allegation of Misconduct / Use of Force  
Disposition:

Allegation:

800 Use of Force: That an officer's use of force during the arrest of a person was in violation of policy.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Completed  
Received date: May 6, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Service level  
Disposition: Dismissed-o/s jurisdic

RP emailed the Auditor upset that she had been unable to get a response from EPD, Park Ambassadors, or Park Watch regarding illegal camping. RP has call over 3 times and gets no response or even someone to come assess the situation.

Per Auditor -Park Watch has made contact with the RP. Dismiss - Outside Jurisdiction.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: May 7, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance  
Disposition:

RP reported being unhappy with the officers who came for her call for a civil stand by when a roommate was moving out of her house and taking her belongings.

---

Incident type: IA Investigation  
Status: Active  
Received date: May 7, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Allegation of Misconduct / Performance  
Disposition:

In the email, RP inquired why a report hadn't been completed related to a dog bite/vicious dog. The employee closed the call by adding notes to the CAD; no report was completed nor were photos taken. The employee did not follow up on the Potentially Dangerous Dog or issue a citation (fix it ticket) for the licensing violation.

Allegation:

103.5.14 Unsatisfactory Performance: It is alleged that an employee failed to complete a police report related to a dog bite/vicious dog incident until directed to do so by his supervisor.

Allegations:

Performance - 103.5.14 Unsatisfactory Performance

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: May 11, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance  
Disposition:

RP reported trying to get EPD to deal with a homeless camp on the railroad property that backs up to

the storage units he manages on Hwy 99. (permission has already been given by the railroad) He and neighbors have called at least 3 times in the last week and are told that they will get right on it. No action has happened to date.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: May 11, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Policy Complaint  
Disposition:

RP expressed a concern that an EPD officer who gave her a citation on Friday was not wearing a mask. RP's feels it was unsafe and would like the policy looked at. RP does not need contact.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Completed  
Received date: May 12, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance  
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP contacted the Auditor's office with concerns that EPD is not doing enough to help him with an ongoing harassment issue with a neighbor.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: May 15, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Policy Complaint  
Disposition:

RP was forwarded to the Auditor's office to voice his concern about the homeless camps along the River.

---

Incident type: IA Investigation  
Status: Active  
Received date: May 18, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Allegation of Misconduct / Performance  
Disposition:

Allegation:

103.5.14 Unsatisfactory Performance: It is alleged that an employee failed to dispatch a patrol officer to a dog bite/vicious dog incident when an Animal Welfare Officer was unavailable.

Allegations:

Performance - 103.5.14 Unsatisfactory Performance

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Completed  
Received date: May 18, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Service level  
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP is concerned about the prohibitive camping at Sorrel Way Park.

---



Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: May 18, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance  
Disposition:

RP is concerned about an ongoing issue at her apartment complex in which a mentally ill man who lives next door has been committing illegal actions and EPD ignores them.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Completed  
Received date: May 18, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance  
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP had a couple of issues with a speeding citation he received. When the officer approached his passenger window he was not wearing a protective face mask or gloves, the officer stuck his face inside his vehicle and touched his car door, clearly breaking social distancing measures.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Completed  
Received date: May 18, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Inquiry  
Disposition: Dismissed-Other

In a series of posts, RP alleges that she made it known to two EPD officer that her ex-husband was mentally abusing her 2 children and was denying visitation even though he has full custody.

She alleges that as mandatory reporters, the officers had a statutory obligation to report the abuse to DHS.

There is no indication in the record of an actual contact with the family by one officer, only emails she sent to him.

Per Auditor: After review of the BWV and based on the Auditor's experience (38 1/2 years) as a mandatory reporter, there is no evidence that the officer violated EPD policies or state law by failing to report alleged abuse as there is no evidence of alleged abuse.

Dismiss per Auditor.

---

Incident type: IA Investigation  
Status: Active  
Received date: May 19, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Allegation of Misconduct / Conduct  
Disposition:

103.5.17 Insubordination - It is alleged that an employee was insubordinate by directing her staff to disregard a Watch Commander's request to obtain information related to another agency's probable cause for a vehicle pursuit that entered Eugene's jurisdiction.

Allegations:

Conduct - 103.5.17 Insubordination

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: May 20, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Policy Complaint  
Disposition:

RP has a concern that EPD is dismissing his security guards and not allowing them to prosecute for trespassing, even when the same individuals continue to trespass at the same locations. They are being told "We're not doing that right now." The trespassers are being told they are free to go.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: May 20, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Policy Complaint  
Disposition:

RP emailed a concern to the Auditor's Office that officers are not wearing masks and did not wear masks when they came to his home.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Completed  
Received date: May 20, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Policy Complaint  
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP expressed a concern about prohibitive camping in Gilbert Park and in the Bethel area. There are tents all up and down Hwy 99, people going through garbage cans at night etc. The areas set up for the homeless during this pandemic are not being utilized, no one appears to be enforcing the laws and RP feels EPD should be doing something.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: May 22, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Use of Force  
Disposition:

RP reported an incident in which he was walking on the bike path near his home at midnight when he heard a voice from the shadow ask to speak with him, RP replied no and kept on walking. The third time the voice spoke it finally identified its self as police and told RP he was under arrest and to get on the ground. RP complied by raising his hands and getting on his knees. The officer came up behind him said "stop resisting" and then pushed his head down on to the pavement, permanently damaging RP's glasses.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Initial  
Received date: May 22, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance  
Disposition:

RP was displeased about a lack of customer service by an officer assigned to his place of employment.

---

Incident type: IA Investigation  
Status: Active  
Received date: May 26, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Allegation of Misconduct / Use of Force  
Disposition:

Allegation:

809 Taser Use: It is alleged that an officer's deployment of the Taser while affecting the arrest of a suspect was in violation of policy.

Allegations:

Use of Force - 809 Taser Use

---

Incident type: Incident Review  
Status: Active  
Received date: May 27, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Incident Review / Performance  
Disposition:

RP reported an incident in which he called for help for his mentally ill daughter who was walking down a road. Cahoots tried to engage with her, but she ignored them, she then got into her mother's car and jumped out going 5 to 10 miles an hour. The officers that responded would not transport her to the Behavioral Health Unit, telling him he should transport her himself, even when he commented a police vehicle would be safer. His daughter once again got in her mom's car and jumped out again at 20 mph, this time resulting in paramedics and an ambulance response. RP would like to know why a person jumping out of a car with a known mental health issue is not a danger to themselves and didn't warrant intervention by the officers.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: May 28, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Policy Complaint  
Disposition:

RP sent the below email to the Auditor:

I am your retired public health physician.  
Public safety employees must all be wearing face masks. The CDC recommends face coverings. Other jurisdictions are wearing masks. The point of the mask is to protect vulnerable folks.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: May 28, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Policy Complaint  
Disposition:

RP is concerned about the prohibited camping he is seeing around town, especially at the West 11th and Beltline area where the creek is being used as a bathroom by the campers. RP noted concerns with the ground water and the creek which feeds into Fern Ridge which people use for recreation. RP feels the issue is not being addressed and laws are being applied arbitrarily.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: May 28, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance  
Disposition:

RP reported a domestic violence issue across the street from his home and specifically asked the call taker to not let the people involved know who had called in. RP learned from his mother that after the officers spoke with the people across the street, they came straight over to his home to speak to him, basically telegraphing to the people who had called.

---

Incident type: Supervisor Action  
Status: Active  
Received date: May 28, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance  
Disposition:

RP expressed concern about the investigation into her daughter's death. RP feels the officer involved led her on and fed her lies and misinformation. RP was led to believe there would be manslaughter charges and just learned from the DA that the case had been closed listing an overdose as the cause of death.

---

28 incidents displayed.