



## 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, July 14, 2020 – 5:30pm

Via Webinar: <https://eugene-or-gov.zoom.us/j/99077712523>

Webinar ID: 990 7771 2523

Password: 0MQ?0RU4

Or join by phone:

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

971 247 1195	669 219 2599	669 900 6833	720 928 9299
206 337 9723	213 338 8477	253 215 8782	346 248 7799
602 753 0140	312 626 6799	470 250 9358	470 381 2552
646 518 9805	651 372 8299	786 635 1003	929 205 6099
	267 831 0333	301 715 8592	

Toll Free:

833 548 0282	877 853 5257	888 475 4499	833 548 0276
--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------

International numbers available: <https://eugene-or-gov.zoom.us/j/99077712523>

<u>Item</u>	<u>Time (Starting)</u>
1. Agenda and Materials Review	5 minutes (5:30pm)
2. Public Comment	15 minutes (5:35pm)
3. Comments from Board Members and Commission Liaisons	15 minutes (5:50pm)
4. Minutes Approval (Minutes from June meeting)	5 minutes (6:05pm)
5. Report from Subcommittee on Meeting Process	10 minutes (6:10pm)
6. Report from Subcommittee on Bylaws	10 minutes (6:20pm)
7. Discussion: Protocols Related to Public Comment	10 minutes (6:30pm)



**City of Eugene  
Civilian Review Board  
Page 2 of 2**

- |   |                     |
|---|---------------------|
| 8. Discussion: Structure of Case Reviews  | 10 minutes (6:40pm) |
| 9. Discussion: Frequency of CRB Meetings, Trainings; Work Plan Proposal                   | 10 minutes (6:50pm) |
| 10. Break   | 10 minutes (7:00pm) |
| 11. Case Review: Allegation Related to Officer's Actions Following Assault<br>At Hospital | 30 minutes (7:10pm) |
| 12. Auditor Report  | 10 minutes (7:40pm) |
| 13. Closing Comments  | 10 minutes (7:50pm) |
| 14. Adjourn   | (8:00pm)            |

**MINUTES**  
Civilian Review Board  
Zoom Webinar

June 9, 2020  
5:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Lindsey Foltz, Rick Roseta, Bernadette Conover, Awab Al-Rawe, Michael Hames-Garcia, Carolyn Williams, Susan Gallagher-Smith (Civilian Review Board members); Beatriz Hernandez, Leia Pitcher, Mark Gissiner, Vicki Cox (Police Auditor's Office staff); Jason Berreth (Eugene Police Department).

ABSENT: None

Chair Lindsey Foltz convened the Civilian Review Board (CRB) at 5:31 p.m. She thanked everyone for being present, the same night that George Floyd's family laid him to rest.

**1. Agenda and Materials Review**

Ms. Foltz wanted to speak briefly about her time on the Board. She had been at this table in front of families who had lost loved ones and who told their stories. At one such meeting she noted that the meeting would not likely be cathartic, but slow and bureaucratic. Despite that, Ms. Foltz believed that the CRB was a move towards justice. She said that her main goal that night was to listen, not speak.

Ms. Foltz wanted to change the agenda to allow for more time for public comment. She proposed moving agenda items around to allow for one hour of public comment.

**MOTION:** Ms. Foltz moved, seconded by Ms. Williams, to approve the agenda. The motion passed unanimously.

**2. Minutes Approval (March Meeting)**

**MOTION:** Mr. Roseta moved, seconded by Ms. Conover, to approve the March 10, 2020 CRB minutes. The motion passed unanimously.

**3. Auditor's Office and CRB Overview**

Ms. Pitcher explained that Eugene had a three-prong approach to civilian oversight: the auditor's office, the police commission, and CRB. The Auditor's Office was created in 2005 alongside CRB by a charter amendment. The Auditor's Office acted as an intake system for complaints against Eugene Police Department (EPD) sworn and non-sworn employees. They could contract for outside investigations when necessary and made recommendations into how investigations could be adjudicated. They also made training recommendations and put out an annual auditor's report.

Ms. Pitcher shared that the Officer receives about 400 complaints per year; they also review around 200 uses of force per year. The Auditor and Deputy Auditor had access to all body camera and car footage, along with anything that EPD would use in an investigation. For allegations of police criminal conduct, they monitor the investigation and review it at completion; for allegations of police misconduct, they participate and oversee the investigation into that misconduct.

Ms. Pitcher noted that CRB would be reviewing three incident reviews that night. Generally, the CRB reviewed closed cases; the process is different for a community impact case.

#### **4. Community Impact Case**

Ms. Pitcher explained that the CRB ordinance allows for the designation of a community impact case. She explained that the Auditor's Office had received a huge amount of community concern and feedback regarding EPD's response to community demonstrations on the weekend of May 29. Since it was such an important issue to the community, the Auditor's Office was recommending that the CRB should accept and designate the investigation into that response as a community impact case. Ms. Pitcher explained that in a community impact case, the CRB would receive the entire investigative file, and within 14 days would meet to discuss and present its determinations in the case. Within 30 days of receiving the case, the CRB would concur with the adjudication, develop recommendations related to the case, and/or require the city to reopen the investigation under certain circumstances (as set out in Eugene City Code §2.244(4)).

Ms. Conover was unclear with how early on they were in the process. She was involved with community impact cases before and mentioned that they usually knew more about what was being investigated at the time they were designated as a community impact case. Ms. Conover understood that a lot had been going on but was unsure what the specific investigation would be focused on. Ms. Pitcher said that she had been talking to Mr. Gissiner and the Police Chief about the complaints and what to focus on. They talked mostly about police response on the night of May 29 and May 31, where EPD utilized crowd control techniques (including tear gas, projectiles, and the issuance of a curfew) that had resulted in multiple complaints. The plan was to investigate the totality of the response, with a deeper look at certain specific incidents that may be outside of policy.

Ms. Foltz inquired into what the process had been like for the last community impact case. Ms. Conover replied that in both situations it was one incident that occurred, not like what they were looking at now. Ms. Foltz asked if her concern was that there was too much to go over and if she wanted them to take it incident by incident. Ms. Conover replied that she was concerned that they would not be able to corral all the information without it being overwhelming. She understood it had to be looked at but was unsure how the CRB would go over it. Ms. Pitcher said that they received complaints that covered the whole weekend, not just one incident. She worried that if they just looked at specific incidents that they would not cover everything sufficiently.

Ms. Williams thought it was valuable to go through the events night by night in order to understand why certain nights were handled differently. She agreed with Ms. Pitcher that they did not want to lose any context.

Mr. Hames-Garcia agreed that they should go night by night. He thought they should take advantage of there not being strict regulations around a community impact case investigation and learn all they could.

**MOTION:** Ms. Williams moved, seconded by Mr. Al-Rawe, to approve the case as a community impact case. The motion passed unanimously.

#### **5. Public Comment**

Matt Mcrae began by acknowledging the difficult situation they found themselves in regarding the racial tension nationwide around the appropriate role of police in cities. He wanted to take time to appreciate the steps made in Eugene around the Crisis Assistance Helping Out on the Streets (CAHOOTS) program, which was being praised nation-wide. Mr. Mcrae noted that there was still much to be done. He wanted to talk about de-escalation techniques that should be used instead of force. Mr. Mcrae asked how they could track de-escalation. He also thought disciplinary oversight needed to be more transparent, since not even the CRB knew the outcome of investigations. Mr. Mcrae felt that reduced accountability. Lastly, he wanted it noted that Oregon public records law should be amended so that body camera footage could be made public.

Zondie Zinke said that she was at the May 29, 2020 protest. She saw that a man, Travis Cannon, intentionally hit a person with his car. Ms. Zinke said that no one had touched the car before he hit the person with it. She had tried to call in as a witness and was told that the case was closed, and they were not interested in her testimony. Ms. Zinke thought it was appalling that police were happy to let a black woman get hit by a car, especially during a peaceful protest around Black Lives Matter. She was furious with the EPD and was unsatisfied with the way that Police Chief Skinner talked about the killing of Eliborio Rodriguez, who she said was originally stopped for wearing dark clothing.

Majeska Seese-Green asked the CRB to reconsider the decision from a couple years ago to not record their meetings. She had attended meetings in the past and learned a lot. Ms. Seese-Green thought now was the time to be transparent and accessible to as many in the community as possible. She noted that when the decision was made Mr. Gissiner had the authority to choose but gave the decision to the CRB. The vote was not unanimous and therefore she believed should be looked at again. She thanked the Board for their work, especially during these uncertain times.

Nina Sobotka requested that the CRB expedite the review of complaints from May 30 to May 31. She wanted the investigation to have a lot of resources and time put into it.

## **6. Comments from Board Members and Commission Liaisons**

Mr. Hames-Garcia thanked the commenter who brought up recording meetings. He agreed that it was a good idea. Mr. Hames-Garcia noted that he has been on the Board now for about a year and thought they needed to advocate for changes in how the review process worked. He believed their meetings were constrained by the format that they followed and did not allow for much conversation.

Mr. Al-Rawe thanked all the speakers for their comments and agreed with Mr. Hames-Garcia that their meeting structure should change. Mr. Al-Rawe added that he would continue to do what he could to advocate for what was happening in the community once he was off the Board. As a person of color, he wanted to raise the voices of others when he could.

Ms. Williams stated that the police murders of George Floyd and Breonna Taylor had put a spotlight on police training. It was a conversation she was happy to see happening. In Eugene they had the Police Commission, the Auditor's Office, and the CRB that worked to investigate police policy violations and misconduct. She believed that was a good start, but they needed to see more public involvement. Also, Ms. Williams suggested that the CRB, or another civilian group, should be involved in the police hiring process as well as the CRB seeing the discipline results of cases they had reviewed. Ms. Williams was concerned whenever they saw the same officer over and over. She believed that the State public record laws needed to change so that body camera footage was public. Lastly, Ms. Williams thought that the police were trying to do too much in their community and should be defunded. She believed that that money could be reallocated to organizations like CAHOOTS, who do so much for the community.

Ms. Gallagher-Smith agreed with what everyone had said before her. She encouraged the Board to communicate better so they can have more dynamic meetings. Ms. Gallagher-Smith was pleased that they would be looking at the community impact case. She knew a lot of people had turned up in person, but even more had been watching protests online. As a result, many people had their perception changed, and she felt that they needed to address what was going on.

Mr. Roseta pledged that he would dedicate his time to making sure that the community impact case was investigated thoroughly. He was encouraged that they already had members from the community speak and was interested to get more from them as they moved through the process.

Ms. Conover stated that the historic reasons for the CRB going through their meetings as they did because the community had felt unclear on where the Board landed when they were done with a case. She agreed that the structure could be binding and that it might be time to reorganize. Ms. Conover said that CAHOOTS was a good organization that worked well with the police. She had heard officers say only positive things about them. Ms. Conover said that at a past community impact case by the end they had wished they it had been more publicly accessible. Even though they gave as much information as they could during the meeting if they were given everything in full there would have been less confusion. She thought that they needed to be clear about what they were reading or referring to during meetings.

Ms. Foltz was interested in the Board changing their meeting lay out. They could investigate what was working and what was being restricting. She stated that they should create a sub-committee within the CRB which would look at their bylaws. Ms. Foltz said that they would get together and have something ready to present at the next CRB meeting.

Ms. Foltz asked if they should include looking into their ordinances. Ms. Conover stated that they had no power over the ordinances and thought they should stick with bylaws and protocols. If they went through everything and felt that the ordinances needed to be looked into, they could ask the Auditor's Office to talk to City Council about making a change.

Mr. Hames-Garcia inquired into making two sub-committees. One focused on their meetings layout and the other on their outward facing recommendations. Ms. Foltz said that would be good if they had enough people volunteering.

Ms. Williams said that there would be turnover happening on their Board before their next meeting, so it might be a good idea to wait for the new members to join. Ms. Conover replied that in the past it has not been a one month turn around, but more like two or three months. They set up the sub-committees now and then might not come back with anything for a couple more months after conversations have happened. Therefore, she thought starting now would be acceptable.

**MOTION:** Ms. Conover moved, seconded by Ms. Williams, to create two sub-committees of the CRB. One to review CRB bylaws and the other to go over meeting protocols. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Foltz asked who wanted to volunteer to be on the sub-committees. Mr. Roseta and Mr. Hames-Garcia volunteered to be on the bylaws sub-committee. Ms. Williams, Ms. Conover, and Ms. Foltz volunteered to be on the meeting protocol sub-committee. Mr. Gissiner said that they would double check if these sub-committees needed to be public. He knew they did not need to have public comment at them but would get back to the committee with more information. Ms. Foltz told him that in the past they were public meetings, but that there was no public comment. Ms. Williams believed that they should have them public, since they wanted to be transparent.

Mr. Roseta said that they needed to prioritize the structural analysis since they would be taking on a community impact case. They needed to be realistic of the time that they would have to review the case. Ms. Foltz asked how long Ms. Pitcher's process would take before coming to the CRB. Ms. Pitcher replied that it would most likely be more than thirty days. Even though it was a high priority, it will take a while to gather all the information. Ms. Foltz said they could try and get some structural change done in that time. Mr. Gissiner added that hopefully no new things would be added to their investigation. The police station was still in emergency mode, but he believed that resources would be allocated to help this investigation go quickly. Compiling all the video, from police and from the community, would take the most amount of time. Ms. Foltz emphasized that they wanted to get as much information from those

nights as possible, not just the big issues. Ms. Pitcher told her that they were going to be as thorough as possible.

Ms. Foltz agreed with what Ms. Williams and Ms. Conover had mentioned about the importance of public knowledge. She wished that the public had more access to what they saw as a Board in investigations and felt that law should change. Ms. Foltz also found it challenging when the Board had no knowledge of disciplinary action that was taking place. She did not feel that they should have a say in what action was taken but should be told what it was.

## **7. Case Review: Incident Reviews: Pursuit Response, Taser Use, Treatment of Arrestee**

Ms. Pitcher presented a slideshow entitled “Case Summaries: Civilian Review Board, June 9, 2020.”

### **I. Complaint #1**

- The Eugene Police Employees Association filed a complaint that while Station One dispatch was broadcasting a pursuit that Springfield Police were involved in, Supervisor A “charged” into the Communications Center floor, “shouting” about the need to monitor the pursuit, “pounded” on the glass door to the supervisor’s office, and then stood next to Station One and began calling the pursuit himself. The complaint further alleged that Supervisor A’s directions were unclear, and that he was condescending to the Communications Center employees.
- IA interviewed a Communications Center supervisor on scene, as well as the employee working Station One dispatch at the time
- Classification: Incident Review

Ms. Foltz asked for a review of the classification system. Ms. Pitcher said that the highest classification was an allegation of criminal conduct, then allegation of serious misconduct, then incident review, and then inquiry/policy complaint/service complaint. Mr. Gissiner added that inquiries had changed with the use of body-camera footage. There were restrictions on how long they had to look at the footage, but the classification could change after viewing if needed.

Ms. Conover said that when this case originally seemed like a complaint of an individual at the call center. She thought there was a lack of communication that would not have happened if there were clearer guidelines. Originally the person felt that having a supervisor there to make a call would be helpful, but that ended up making it worse. Ms. Conover felt that the issue was with the pursuit policy. She thought it would have been useful for the Board in the investigation to know what the call center looked like.

Ms. Williams thought that cross-department communication was the main issue and there needed to be standard practices to follow.

Mr. Roseta stated that it seemed like there was a personality issue behind the complaint. He was struck by the need for clarification over who was in charge, which was a policy issue.

Mr. Hames-Garcia felt confused by the case and thought there might be missing information. He had been reading about overworked officers recently and wondered if maybe that could have played a part.

Ms. Gallagher-Smith would support education into compliance and clarification on procedure.

Ms. Foltz noted that this was an officer they had seen many times. This incident was confusing to follow but was an example of her annoyance with what happens when an officer received a complaint. She asked if this was a type of policy recommendation the Board wanted brought to the Police Commission. Ms. Conover disclosed that she used to socialize with this officer in the past and was aware of other complaints made against them. She was unsure how exactly this issue was handled with the officer’s

supervisor, so it might not need to go forward to the Police Commission. It seemed to her that it all depended on what officer walked in that day, and that with most other officers would not have acted that way. Mr. Roseta felt unsure about the Board getting information on disciplinary action taken after a complaint. He felt that officers had a right to privacy.

## II. Complaint #2

- Officer A responded to a reported car break-in. The suspect ran when Officer A attempted to contact him, and after a short foot pursuit and a Taser warning, Officer A deployed his Taser. The suspect was not injured except for the Taser probe strikes. Following review of body-worn video, the Auditor opened an investigation into Officer A's use of the Taser.
- Investigation included written report, body-worn video, dispatch records, the use of force report, and a review of the incident by the Defensive Tactics supervisor. That supervisor determined that the use of the Taser was objectively reasonable under the circumstances, specifically citing the suspects "active and physical resistance." However, the supervisor was concerned that information relevant to the Officer's decision to use the Taser was not included in the report. The complaint was referred to Officer A's supervisor to address the inadequacies with his reporting.
- Classification: Originally classified as allegation but reclassified to an Incident Review

Mr. Gissiner clarified that the classification was changed because they needed to look at the body-camera footage and received more information on the case.

Ms. Gallagher-Smith was concerned that the written report did not have enough detail. She was hopeful that the officers would receive further training. Ms. Gallagher-Smith emphasized that the CRB was reliant on those reports being thorough and well written.

Mr. Hames-Garcia agreed that the report needed to be written well. He was unsure if the officer needed retraining, since it did not seem like something that needed to be taught twice. Mr. Hames-Garcia believed that someone should be able to write a report before they could tase someone.

Mr. Al-Rawe asked how long the officer was in service. Ms. Pitcher knew based on the name the person was relatively new. Mr. Al-Rawe asked if someone could talk about the policy when pursuing a person when they seem to pose no threat. Sgt. Berreth replied that they could use force on someone who was running. He added that they could not use deadly force if someone was not posing a threat, but they could tase or pepper spray. Mr. Gissiner added that there were two physical altercations before the person ran away, which made it reasonable under the policy. Sgt. Berreth clarified that their policy did not allow someone to be tased just for running away. Mr. Roseta agreed that the policy was objective depending on the circumstances and that there needed to be a reason to tase someone beyond the person running.

Ms. Williams wanted it clarified if the auditor's office got every use of force incident sent to them. Mr. Gissiner responded that they did. He added that they usually went over every case and could open an investigation if they wanted. They received around two hundred use of force cases a year. Ms. Williams asked if this case was brought to them by Blue Team or a supervisor. Mr. Gissiner believed that it was brought to their attention by someone at EPD because of the report but could not exactly remember. Ms. Williams noted that there seemed to be six seconds between the tase warning and them being deployed. She asked if that was a normal amount of time to wait. Ms. Pitcher replied that she had seen a lot of use of force cases and thought that was a reasonable amount of time since the person had time to react. Ms. Williams reminded the Board and Auditor's Office that they needed to use gender neutral pronouns.

Ms. Foltz mentioned that the complaint was referred to the supervisor to address the inadequacies with the reporting, which was the only way it came to the Auditor's Office. She appreciated that they went to speak to the Defensive Tactics supervisor to get more information on general practice. Ms. Foltz found it



disturbing when reports were incomplete or not filled out well. For the justice system to function successfully reports needed to be written well.

Ms. Conover said that it was interesting to see how things had changed with Blue Team being implemented. She was happy to see that it was working well and getting more cases reviewed. Ms. Conover had noticed on the report that it said that it was incomplete and should just be used to refresh the persons account. She stated that the report was there for the officer and would never give a realistic account of what happened. However, she agreed that the officer needed to be talked to about providing more details. Mr. Gissiner shared that when he first started in Eugene, he was surprised about how much information was in reports. Mr. Hames-Garcia understood that there was a range of detail for reports, but he felt that if someone were tased that an officer should know that more information would be needed.

### III. Complaint #3

- RP contacted the Auditor's office and stated that the officers who arrested her left her pursue on the roof of her car. She also stated that she had left voicemails for the arresting officer to report a theft and that someone was fraudulently using her debit card, but the officer had not returned her calls.
- Investigation included body-worn video, complaint intake, and the related police reports. The video showed that after the RP was arrested, her personal property (including cash, a pocketknife, and necklace) were placed on the trunk of her vehicle. While one officer transported RP to jail, another officer placed RP's personal items in a black backpack and placed the backpack and a purse inside the trailer. The trailer was secured with RP's padlock. The investigation into the property was closed.
- The investigation was forwarded to the officer's supervisor, who coached the officer regarding the return of phone calls.
- Classification: Incident Review

Ms. Gallagher-Smith found it concerning in the tapes that there was a lot of silence at times. She mentioned that in past cases EPD officers had worked hard to be respectful and de-escalate when necessary. While there were missing pieces, Ms. Gallagher-Smith hoped that de-escalation techniques had been used.

Ms. Williams agreed that there should have been more de-escalation. She believed it would have been good for CAHOOTS to be involved. She was concerned with how many voicemails were left for the officer and how they were not responded to until the person reached out to the Auditor's Office. Ms. Williams said that she liked when officers stated when they were muting their cameras for tactical reasons. In this situation they did not voice that and the conversations happening did not seem tactical. Ms. Williams wondered why the case was not escalated to more than Incident Review because she felt that a couple things went wrong. Mr. Gissiner replied that they had focused on the property issue. He believed that the incident review was a good classification. Mr. Gissiner thought there was usually not a reason to mute, but it was done to get around possible liability issues. With all the protests going on the Police Chief told officers that they could not turn off their microphones.

Mr. Roseta was concerned with the arrestee being in a bad mental state. He wondered if the officer should have done more to get that person to a hospital, however the individual seemed calm when they arrived at the jail.

Ms. Foltz agreed that the muting of the microphones was a concern, but that in all instances they had seen the body-cameras were being used correctly and could be relied on. Ms. Williams reiterated that she believed body-camera footage should be available to the public.

## **8. Auditor Report**

Mr. Gissiner thanked Mr. Al-Rawe and Ms. Gallagher-Smith for their time serving on the CRB. He hoped that they would think about joining other commissions since they both gave good points of view and were thorough when reviewing cases.

Mr. Gissiner said that Ms. Hernandez had been doing so much work for the Emergency Operations Center on COVID-19 updates and translating speeches for Mayor Vinis. He thanked her for all her hard work in making sure their Spanish speaking community was being updated.

Mr. Gissiner said that there had been an increase in complaints since the protests started, at least ten a day. They were working on those complaints and creating the community impact case. They were also working on two use of force cases. They review use of force every year and notify the Police Chief if an officer has an unusually high amount of cases against them.

Ms. Pitcher announced that their annual report was out and on their website. She would also put an update out about the CRB voting to move along with the community impact case.

## **9. Closing Comments**

Everyone thanked Mr. Al-Rawe and Ms. Gallagher-Smith for their time on the Board and the perspectives they were able to share.

Ms. Conover hoped that the community impact case would move forward peacefully but was worried that since the events spanned so many nights it would not get done in thirty days. She said everyone should be patient and that she would rather it take longer and be done correctly.

Mr. Hames-Garcia was glad he was able to join the Board the previous year and hoped to learn more over the next year.

Ms. Williams wanted to thank the community that showed up for the meeting. She encouraged the people watching to continue showing up.

Ms. Gallagher-Smith said that it had been a pleasure serving on the CRB. It was a good chance to see how EPD and the Auditor's Office worked.

Mr. Al-Rawe thanked everyone and said that it had been a pleasure to serve on the Board. He stated that he would want to come back to the Board in the future. Mr. Al-Rawe mentioned that he would continue to be involved when he could.

Ms. Foltz was proud that the CRB had members with different perspectives. She wanted input on a couple things. One was the Chief's early warning system. Ms. Foltz felt that that information was something they could use in Auditor's Reports or Annual Reports. Also, from the community she had heard the desire for more civilian involvement in officer training and hiring. While the CRB had nothing to do with those issues, she wanted to mention it. Ms. Foltz said that she would be going to the Police Commission on June 11, 2020 and wanted to know if anyone else wanted to be at the table when they were going over EPD policies. Ms. Williams was interested in all CRB voices being on a task force or committee. Mr. Roseta and Mr. Hames-Garcia were both willing to be involved. Ms. Foltz believed that they could request that a task force be formed. Ms. Gallagher-Smith thought that it was important to have community input on these policy decisions.

**MOTION:** Mr. Roseta moved, seconded by Ms. Williams, to ask Council to create a task force including both Police Commission and CRB members to examine structural policy reform at EPD. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Foltz said that she would work with staff to create an outline for the task force before the Police Commission meeting. She thanked everyone for their willingness to serve.

Ms. Pitcher pointed out that there would be two new CRB members at the next meeting: Bill Whalen and José Cortez.

Ms. Foltz asked CRB members to bring any case from the closed cases to her attention if they wanted to have it reviewed.

**10. Adjourn – Next Meeting July 14, 2020**

Ms. Foltz adjourned the meeting at 8:05 p.m.

*(Minutes recorded by Lydia Dysart)*

## CRB Meetings Subcommittee Minutes

June 24, 2020

Members present: Bernadette Conover, Lindsey Foltz, Carolyn Williams.

Staff present: Leia Pitcher, Beatriz Otero-Hernandez

Convened 1:02pm

Discussion Topics:

- Origin and flexibility (or inflexibility) of CRB Bylaws and Protocols
- Structure of case review at CRB meetings
  - o Recommended changes to the Case Review sheet, including a space at the top for general comments and condensing some of the categories for review
- Ideas to encourage participation from Board and Community
- Training of new members
- Public engagement/comment
- Member engagement
- Public comment at CRB meetings
  - o Recommendation to be clear in letters to RP that protocols do not allow public comment on the case under review
  - o Recommendation that the limitation on public comment be included on the agenda as well
- Recording of meetings
  - o Recommendation that this be considered by members as a likely issue for discussion as a group going forward

Adjourned 2:15pm

## CRB Bylaws Subcommittee Minutes

June 25, 2020

Members Present: Michael Hames-Garcia, Rick Roseta. Staff Present: Leia Pitcher, Deputy Police Auditor

Meeting convened 11:00am on Zoom (with public access)

### Items of Discussion:

- Access to disciplinary records – agreed that Auditor Staff would make a resource to go with CRB Protocols showing the source for the rules around disciplinary records
- Possibility of Elected CRB members?
- Recording of Meetings – also discussed at CRB Meetings Subcommittee
- Case Review Form – also discussed at CRB Meetings Subcommittee
  - Recommendation to add section on Policy recommendations for Police Commission, perhaps in or near the Policy discussion space
- Recommendation that the entire CRB look at Case Review structure, since the issue arose in both Subcommittee Meetings
- Policy complaints are of importance to CRB – staff can work on highlighting those in the closed cases provided to CRB or reporting to CRB in a different way
- Discussed communications with reporting parties and officers both before and after CRB review
- Discussed community impact cases as a tool that may potentially be used more often to provide more transparency
  - Also discussed how cases are designated as such and that ordinance does not preclude CRB identifying such cases and requesting the Auditor designate them for consideration of CIC status by the CRB
- Recommendation that the entire CRB look at meeting frequency and training frequency

Meeting adjourned 10:59am.

## June 2020 Open Case Report

---

### Allegations of Misconduct

**Received:** Jun 04, 2020

**Status:** Active

**Incident summary:**

RP filed a complaint that an officer failed to use body cam during a stop.

Per Auditor, dismiss on the camera complaint because cameras were on. However, review of the file indicated that officer's search of RP's fannypack was apparently in violation of her constitutional rights and EPD policy.

Allegations:

1. 103.5.14 Unsatisfactory Performance: That Officer A did not perform the required tasks associated with the duties of their position when they failed to oversee the actions of a recruit officer and failed to take appropriate actions to manage the scene.
2. 322.7 Search and Seizure: That Officer A effected a seizure of RP in violation of RP's constitutional rights when the officer arrested RP based on evidence found in an improper search of personal property.

---

**Received:** Jun 17, 2020

**Status:** Active

**Incident summary:**

Supervisor A was assigned as a team leader and deployed to assist with crowd control after a very large rally/march. Supervisor A was equipped with a 40mm launcher.

Allegations:

- 1-4. 800 Use of Force: That Supervisor A used force in excess of that which is reasonably necessary under the circumstances when they deployed a 40mm sponge round in four separate incidents.

### Allegation of Misconduct: 2 incidents

---

### Incident Reviews

**Received:** Jun 01, 2020

**Status:** Active

**Incident summary:**

Catch-all for complaints related to EPD response to demonstrations on Saturday, 5/30 and Sunday 5/31, into am hours of Monday, 6/1. Classified as Incident Review to investigate further to identify potential named employees and policy violations. --LKP

Common complaints:

1. tear gas cannister at a reporter who was not violating curfew.
2. EPD indicated to a journalist that their status of a journalist did not exempt them from curfew.
3. use of tear gas

4. deploying pepperballs and sponge rounds at protestors who were walking home
  5. that officers did not give sufficient time between notice of curfew and enforcement of curfew.
- 

**Received:** Jun 03, 2020 20:00

**Status:** Active

**Incident summary:**

Complaints for the night of May 29, May 30 and May 31 regarding the Chief's decisions as follows:

- a) not using reasonable law enforcement resources to protect property in the downtown area;
- b) using law enforcement resources unreasonably by authorizing the use of CS canisters, pepper projectiles and 40 mm projectiles in the downtown area.

According to Eugene Council Ordinance Number 20435:

"...If the auditor receives an allegation against the chief of police, the auditor shall forward a copy of the allegation to the City Manager. The City Manager shall notify the council, and investigate the allegation. The manager shall keep the auditor informed of the progress of the investigation.

b) Upon completion of the investigation, but prior to the finalization of the investigation report, the City Manager shall provide the auditor with a draft of the report. The auditor shall review the draft report and provide comments about the draft to the manager within seven days of receiving the draft. The manager shall consider any comments received from the auditor and finalize the report within seven days. Once the city manager issues a decision on the allegation, the manager shall inform the council of the manager's decision related to the allegation...."

Referred to City Manager for investigation and adjudication.

---

**Received:** Jun 17, 2020 12:41

**Status:** Completed Jun 26, 2020

Disposition - Supervisor Review-Closed

**Incident summary:**

RP posted on the CET Facebook page a complaint about EPD taking enforcement action against her neighbor, when RP believed that the neighbor had been verbally attacked.

Alleging that officer failed to investigate Person A, a white male, for harassment yet arrested (actually cited) Person B, a Black male, for physical harassment.

Assigned for criminal investigative follow up on underlying case. The investigation revealed no reasonable suspicion to believe that Person A committed a bias-related crime against Person B.

---

**Received:** Jun 18, 2020

**Status:** Completed Jun 26, 2020

Disposition - Supervisor Review-Closed

**Incident summary:**

During review of video evidence related to protest/riot activity, an audio recording of an EPD employee using potentially offensive language was identified. Sgt. was assigned to conduct a review of the available material to determine the circumstances surrounding the recording.

---

**Received:** Jun 29, 2020

**Status:** Initial

**Incident summary:**

Numerous citizens contacted the Auditor's Office with the concern that EPD detained but released the man who allegedly hit a protester with their vehicle during a children's march on 6/28/20.

**Incident Review: 5 incidents**

---

**Inquiries****Received:** Jun 01, 2020 11:58**Status:** Completed Jun 18, 2020

Disposition - Administratively Closed

**Incident summary:**

The complaints originally linked to this number have been moved and merged with a separate investigation per Auditor. This file can be closed.

This filed has been reclassified to an inquiry and administratively closed.

---

**Received:** Jun 01, 2020 13:25**Status:** Completed Jun 18, 2020

Disposition - Administratively Closed

**Incident summary:**

This complaint has been linked and merged with a separate investigation per Auditor. This case has been reclassified to an inquiry and administratively closed.

---

**Received:** Jun 01, 2020 13:55**Status:** Completed Jun 03, 2020

Disposition - Dismissed-alt remedy

**Incident summary:**

RP complained that a citizen that was only trying to protect himself and his family by shooting his weapon on the ground to disperse rioters was charged.

Dismiss - alternative remedy.

---

**Received:** Jun 01, 2020 12:43**Status:** Completed Jun 16, 2020

Disposition - Supervisor Review-Closed

**Incident summary:**

RP is trying to speak with a supervisor about an attempt-to-locate notice for his son and provide information and evidence to the investigator about the false allegations that are being made by his son's ex-girlfriend and mother of his children. RP's son has various medical issues and PTSD when it comes to police and needs RP's help with communicating with police. They have spoken with the officer involved and with a Sgt. and are only being told they have probable cause. RP and his son feel they do not have the complete picture.

---



**Received:** Jun 01, 2020  
**Status:** Completed Jun 03, 2020  
Disposition - Dismissed-Other

**Incident summary:**

RP filed a complaint form with concerns about cops dating from 2015, as well as statements regarding monsters so evil they don't care who they hurt to go after him.

Dismiss - Auditor, other.

---

**Received:** Jun 03, 2020 15:00  
**Status:** Active

**Incident summary:**

RP filled out a complaint form alleging her son is being ignored or not taken seriously by EPD when he tries to report being assaulted.

---

**Received:** Jun 04, 2020 14:18  
**Status:** Completed Jun 09, 2020  
Disposition - Dismissed-Timeliness

**Incident summary:**

RP filed a complaint form about an incident from 2014 in which he was assaulted.

Dismiss - timeliness.

---

**Received:** Jun 05, 2020  
**Status:** Completed Jun 09, 2020  
Disposition - Dismissed-alt remedy

**Incident summary:**

RP complained about a traffic citation for no turn on red in which he is sure it had turned green before he proceeded.

Dismiss Auditor - Alternative Remedy

---

**Received:** Jun 06, 2020 15:04  
**Status:** Completed Jun 09, 2020  
Disposition - Dismissed-Other

**Incident summary:**

RP alleged that sometime after the turn of the year he reported an assault to an officer who would not respond to the report at all.

\*\*Duplicate Entry - Will be combined and reviewed as part of a related complaint

---

**Received:** Jun 08, 2020  
**Status:** Completed Jun 22, 2020  
Disposition - Supervisor Review-Closed

**Incident summary:**

RP inquired into whether the tear gas used by EPD has an expiration date on it. RP stated that the LCC paper was claiming that tear gas has such a date and the older it is, the worse effect it has on people and that this out of date tear gas was used this last weekend.

---

**Received:** Jun 08, 2020 14:35

**Status:** Completed Jun 24, 2020

Disposition - Supervisor Review-Closed

**Incident summary:**

RP claimed that he was punched in the back by an officer while sitting peacefully at the Agate Station on 6/1/20 (Investigation indicated actually 5/29). This caused him an injury and he went to the ER. RP then crossed the street sat under a tree where the officer gave him a citation for harassment.

---

**Received:** Jun 09, 2020

**Status:** Completed Jun 12, 2020

Disposition - Dismissed-EE Not Identif

**Incident summary:**

RP complained that an undercover officer tried to pull him into a sting while he was out on a early morning walk (0200-0230). The man came up to him and said "looking to smoke some pot" RP walked away, he knows it is illegal to smoke in public and doesn't appreciate being set up.

Note: Review by supervisor indicated this was not an EPD officer. Per Auditor - OK to Dismiss - Employee not Identifiable.

---

**Received:** Jun 10, 2020 11:28

**Status:** Active

**Incident summary:**

Anonymous reported an incident in which he felt an officer was extremely rude and intimidating with him. RP was out walking his dog near his home and came across two officers sitting in their vehicle. As he come up to them one officer got out and questioned if the dog was his, RP said yes and told the officer he would put his 8lb dog on the leash. The officer rudely commented that he was the number one complaint in the neighborhood. RP lives near the bike path with all kinds of transients and meth users around, and questions that him and his 8lb dog are the main complaint. This morning on 6/10/20 the same two officers were sitting in front of his house, which RP felt was an attempt to harass him. RP retreated back into his house not wanting a confrontation and the call center told him that the officers had not been dispatched to the area.

---

**Received:** Jun 10, 2020 00:35

**Status:** Completed Jun 12, 2020

Disposition - Dismissed-Other

**Incident summary:**

RP submitted a complaint form with incident dates from 2004-2020, including several events in his life. The only reference to police was when someone attacked him and he stated he was on the phone with police for three days.

Dismissed per Auditor. Other.

---

**Received:** Jun 12, 2020  
**Status:** Completed Jun 16, 2020  
Disposition - Dismissed-Timeliness

**Incident summary:**

RP complained that a hate crime complaint filed in 2016 has not been investigated and the case dismissed due to statute of limitations. RP has tried to speak with the detective and supervisor and gets nowhere. RP sent information to them recently and feels the supervisor kept information from the detective.

Dismissed – timeliness – EPD had not received any recent information.

---

**Received:** Jun 14, 2020 15:06  
**Status:** Completed Jun 19, 2020  
Disposition - Dismissed-Other

**Incident summary:**

RP emailed the Auditor's Office with an unclear reference to exposing several undercovers to the crowd at yesterday's protest (Possibly 6/13/20) and complaining that they illegally detained him to protect their squad and budget.

Dismissed – Other: No EPD contacts since May 4, 2020.

---

**Received:** Jun 15, 2020 10:16  
**Status:** Completed Jun 16, 2020  
Disposition - Dismissed-Timeliness

**Incident summary:**

RP reported an incident from 2016 in which he feels EPD officer handled the situation incorrectly, related to a verbal altercation between RP and RP's girlfriend.

Inquiry: Dismiss per Auditor. Timeliness.

---

**Received:** Jun 15, 2020 14:10  
**Status:** Completed Jul 06, 2020  
Disposition - Supervisor Review-Closed

**Incident summary:**

RP reported an incident that she observed near her home on 6/13/20. An Apt. Complex Manager had called in a drunk person in a vehicle in their parking lot. When officers arrived, the vehicle started to leave. Then RP stated that one of the officers stated over the loud speaker "Get out of the car or we'll shoot." RP felt during these times this was a totally inappropriate and an over the top statement to make. It did not appear that any officers' lives were in danger.

---

**Received:** Jun 15, 2020 07:33  
**Status:** Completed Jun 19, 2020  
Disposition - Dismissed-o/s jurisdic

**Incident summary:**

RP emailed the Auditor with a narrative about her life and the issues she has had with family abuse and having to fight her family for her children. RP mentioned several small cities in Oregon where these things had occurred, but did not mention Eugene or contact with EPD.

Dismiss, per Auditor.

---

**Received:** Jun 18, 2020 11:07  
**Status:** Completed Jun 19, 2020  
Disposition - Dismissed-Other

**Incident summary:**

RP called the Auditor to complain about a KVAL video she saw of the naked man in Eugene this week. RP stated that at the end of the KVAL clip one officer kicked the naked man and another slugged him twice. RP feels there is no need for EPD to be kicking and slugging a mentally disabled person they already had on the ground. He should have been put in a CAHOOTS van and been done with it.

No TV video of the incident was found; Review of body-worn video shows no evidence to support an allegation of excessive force.

Dismiss per Auditor.

---

**Received:** Jun 19, 2020 12:11  
**Status:** Completed Jun 24, 2020  
Disposition - Dismissed-Other

**Incident summary:**

RP emailed the Chief with an issue about the sale of her house and possible illegal activity listing various public figures.

No EPD contacts since 2018. Per Auditor - OK to Dismiss – Other

---

**Received:** Jun 22, 2020  
**Status:** Completed Jun 23, 2020  
Disposition - Dismissed-o/s jurisdic

**Incident summary:**

RP reported seeing EPD and other government vehicles parking on the sidewalk near the County building on 7th Avenue between Pearl and Oak. RP believes this looks bad, since the ordinary citizen is not able to do this and that 1/2 a block away is a county parking lot. RP does not need contact.

Note: Preliminary investigation showed County vehicles that currently park at the location RP is reporting (not EPD).

Per Auditor: OK to Dismiss - Outside Jurisdiction

---

**Received:** Jun 22, 2020 12:22  
**Status:** Active

**Incident summary:**

RP reported filming a man being arrested and was concerned that he was not Mirandized nor was he given a reason for the warrant he was being arrested on.

RP provided Video -linked

An anonymous male also called in a concern about the same incident. 6/22/20 Intake linked.

---

**Received:** Jun 29, 2020 09:50

**Status:** Initial

**Incident summary:**

RP emailed the Chief with a concern about EPD not responding to a theft call, RP then went on to mention possible restraining order issues. No names, or addresses were provided by RP; additional information has been requested.

---

**Received:** Jun 29, 2020 20:31

**Status:** Completed Jun 30, 2020

Disposition - Dismissed-Other

**Incident summary:**

RP emailed a concern about a trio of young people he had observed walking down a road on May 21, 2020. When RP drove back by a bit later he notice the kids were separated and sitting on the curb with two EPD officers standing over them. RP feels this may have been them being picked on for being brown. RP would like to be sure the that proper protocols and judgment were exercised in this case.

Per Auditor - Dismissed after review of body-worn video.

**Inquiry: 25 incidents**

---

**Policy Complaints**

**Received:** Jun 01, 2020

**Status:** Completed Jul 06, 2020

Disposition - Supervisor Review-Closed

**Incident summary:**

RP, a supervisor at a store, called with a concern that one of her employees biking to work on 6/1/20 about 0030 was not allowed to cross the Ferry Street Bridge even though he was able to show his work ID. RP is not sure if the issue was he was on a bike, but she would like to get the word out that she needs her employees to report to work.

---

**Received:** Jun 02, 2020 11:02

**Status:** Active

**Incident summary:**

RP, who lives in Dexter, was upset that his phone went off every 1/2 hour on 6/1/20 keeping him awake to notify him of a curfew in Eugene. RP has a 14-hour day in front of him and wants to know how to get off of this notification list.

---

**Received:** Jun 02, 2020

**Status:** Completed Jul 07, 2020

Disposition - Supervisor Review-Closed

**Incident summary:**

RP was concerned about the harassment of essential workers during the protests. His workers were turned back from certain areas and others were allowed to roam freely. Very unequal in how it was handled. RP also expressed dismay about the phone alerts about the curfew that kept waking his employees up.

---

**Received:** Jun 03, 2020  
**Status:** Completed Jul 06, 2020  
Disposition - Supervisor Review-Closed

**Incident summary:**

RP was concerned that EPD allowed protestors to ride in vehicles without seatbelts, even, standing in the back of trucks.

---

**Received:** Jun 11, 2020  
**Status:** Completed Jul 06, 2020  
Disposition - Supervisor Review-Closed

**Incident summary:**

RP inquired into why Ballet Fantastique on Oak Street was not notified about the man on top of the parking structure who had a gun. They were not evacuated nor told to lock down and they had children in the studio at the time.

---

**Received:** Jun 15, 2020 14:20  
**Status:** Completed Jun 17, 2020  
Disposition - Supervisor Review-Closed

**Incident summary:**

Anonymous would like to remind CAHOOTS about keeping interactions from citizens confidential. A couple of years ago RP had a interaction with CAHOOTS which went well at the time. Later he heard from other people that they had been told about the incident from CAHOOTS workers. It was very hurtful at the time that his confidential information was not kept private.

---

**Received:** Jun 16, 2020 11:27  
**Status:** Completed Jul 06, 2020  
Disposition - Supervisor Review-Closed

**Incident summary:**

RP is concerned about all the campers in the Washington and Jefferson Park and how they are now moving out into her neighborhood.

---

**Received:** Jun 16, 2020 12:42  
**Status:** Completed Jun 22, 2020  
Disposition - Supervisor Review-Closed

**Incident summary:**

RP was directed to the Auditor's Office with her concern about the camping in the Washington Jefferson park. RP who lives in the area can no longer walk in her usual places and fights are breaking out at night and damage to property is beginning to happen. RP has had to put up security camera at her own expense. RP would like to talk to someone about the situation and what the plan is.

---

**Received:** Jun 17, 2020 10:45  
**Status:** Completed Jun 23, 2020  
Disposition - Supervisor Review-Closed

**Incident summary:**

RP, a concerned parent and citizen is concerned about an illegal homeless camp on the other side of his fence under a no camping sign. The camp is growing in size, with drugs in the open, vulgar language, trashing of the area and trash being thrown into his yard. RP has small children and would like to see this dealt with.

---

**Received:** Jun 18, 2020 11:45  
**Status:** Active

**Incident summary:**

RP is exasperated at the condition of the right of way at 1st and Jefferson, as well as what is happening in the park. RP lives in the Whitaker area and has a rental property in this area. There are now at least 15 tents lined up along the street with trash piling up. This situation needs to be taken care of, it is unfair to the Whitaker property owners and taxpayers.

---

**Received:** Jun 20, 2020 14:09  
**Status:** Completed Jul 06, 2020  
Disposition - Supervisor Review-Closed

**Incident summary:**

RP was at a local restaurant and because she saw a couple of EPD officers without masks she went elsewhere.

---

**Received:** Jun 29, 2020  
**Status:** Active

**Incident summary:**

RP is concerned about how EPD is handling the marches and riots in Eugene. Allowing the destruction of property earlier this month and now the flag burning at the jail on 6/29/20. To RP, this is not policing. RP would like to know who is directing the response in Eugene and why more is not being done like in Springfield.

---

**Received:** Jun 29, 2020  
**Status:** Completed Jul 07, 2020  
Disposition - Supervisor Review-Closed

**Incident summary:**

RP inquired into why EPD trespassed protesters from the Whole Foods parking lot, which is private property. RP spoke with managers, and security personnel and was told that they did not initiate the trespass.

**Policy Complaint: 13 incidents**

---

## Service Complaints

**Received:** Jun 01, 2020 09:30  
**Status:** Completed Jul 01, 2020  
Disposition - Supervisor Review-Closed

**Incident summary:**

RP is concerned that the two times she has reported incidents with her neighbor the report says something different from what the officers tell them. One incident concerned damage to her car, the other about a report she made of her neighbor abusing his child. The officers listened to some other neighbors who are friends of RP's neighbor instead of RP.

---

**Received:** Jun 01, 2020 12:52  
**Status:** Active

**Incident summary:**

RP is getting the runaround about not being contacted by EPD when her stolen vehicle was recovered in a different county. It was recovered on May 25th and EPD was contacted by 0200. She was not notified until she received a letter from the towing company.

---

**Received:** Jun 01, 2020  
**Status:** Completed Jun 03, 2020  
Disposition - Dismissed-o/s jurisdic

**Incident summary:**

RP reported a concern that when she called in a welfare check on her 3 year old son who was with his father she was given the impression the riot was more important than her emergency. The call takers told her they would get there as soon as they could. RP called various other times over the course of the evening and they still hadn't checked on her son. Finally the next morning around 0830 she called and found out that officers had checked on her son and said he was sleeping peacefully on the couch. No one ever called her back about the contact with her son.

Note: Welfare Check conducted by Springfield PD at the request of an EPD Supervisor due to protests downtown.

Per Auditor: OK to Dismiss - Outside Jurisdiction

---

**Received:** Jun 02, 2020 17:37  
**Status:** Completed Jun 17, 2020  
Disposition - Supervisor Review-Closed

**Incident summary:**

RP was concerned about how a community member was contacted by EPD regarding an upcoming protest event.

---

**Received:** Jun 03, 2020 12:34  
**Status:** Active

**Incident summary:**

RP is upset with the investigation by an officer of the man who shot a handgun during the protest on 5/31/20. RP was a witness to the situation and feels the officer interrupted his narrative and tried to shape his testimony of what happened by interjecting what the shooter had said. RP was then dismayed to see that the only charge filed on the



man was unlawful discharge of a firearm.

---

**Received:** Jun 03, 2020 13:09

**Status:** Completed Jul 07, 2020

Disposition - Supervisor Review-Closed

**Incident summary:**

RP reported a couple of trailers that were stolen to an officer the 2nd week of May. When he spoke with the officer on 6/1/20 about possibly getting surveillance video he was denied service due to "COVID" and he does not believe that excuse.

---

**Received:** Jun 03, 2020

**Status:** Active

**Incident summary:**

RP is concerned that a report he filed with an officer is inaccurate. The officer appeared to get the information he provided wrong, gave inaccurate information to the people she was calling on the phone, ask them the wrong questions, getting the wrong answers and tried to convince him the they were the answers to his questions. The officer also sent him to urgent care to get an x-ray and he was refused, because they don't take police cases, when RP told the officer, the officer appeared to not believe him. RP feels the investigation has been inadequate.

---

**Received:** Jun 04, 2020

**Status:** Completed Jun 15, 2020

Disposition - Supervisor Review-Closed

**Incident summary:**

RP is upset with how an officer handled an incident on 6/3/20 in which his truck was bashed in by a guy from the drug house down the street. The guy was stopped by neighbors and the women officer who responded wanted him to press charges, which RP knows would only make him a target. Then the officer said well you have insurance, which is was an insult to him. RP also noted nothing has not done about the drug house even though they have called and called.

---

**Received:** Jun 05, 2020 11:05

**Status:** Completed Jun 25, 2020

Disposition - Supervisor Review-Closed

**Incident summary:**

RP is concerned that her report of rape on 5/29/20 seems to be going nowhere. RP's has provided a rape kit, she has bruising etc. and she has shown officers her text messages with the man in which he admits it. She stated that she is being told that it is not enough evidence.

---

**Received:** Jun 08, 2020 10:05

**Status:** Active

**Incident summary:**

RP inquired into why a young man who crashed into her vehicle parked in front of her home was not cited for DUII, hit and run or reckless driving. A neighbor was able to see which house the young man went to, and he later admitted to them that he had drank too much, the back of her vehicle was totaled and even her insurance is questioning why no citations.

---

**Received:** Jun 12, 2020 19:52  
**Status:** Completed Jun 22, 2020  
Disposition - Supervisor Review-Closed

**Incident summary:**

RP is concerned that an officer wandered into a private dance class after responding to a traffic accident in the area, looked around at safety posters near the entrance and when asked if he could be helped said I'm just looking around, then asked if he could sign-up.

---

**Received:** Jun 19, 2020 10:18  
**Status:** Completed Jun 23, 2020  
Disposition - Dismissed-Other

**Incident summary:**

An anonymous caller was upset that EPD was doing nothing about the street being vandalized in front of the Federal Courthouse. RP is upset that taxpayers will have to foot the bill for the repairs.

Per Auditor - OK to Dismiss – Other

---

**Received:** Jun 21, 2020 06:08  
**Status:** Active

**Incident summary:**

RP is concerned that EPD did not respond to her call for service about her ex-husband coming to her home when the day before she had been told by an officer and a detective that a warrant for this arrest had been filed due to alleged child abuse. RP was put on hold twice by 911 to answer other calls, and the call log the next day did not reflect an officer had even been dispatched. RP also texted the Detective and did not hear back.

---

**Received:** Jun 23, 2020 11:40  
**Status:** Completed Jun 26, 2020  
Disposition - Dismissed-Timeliness

**Incident summary:**

RP still has concerns about an incident from 2018 in which he was assaulted outside Autzen Stadium. The officer who responded told him they would follow him to the hospital to take a statement, which did not happen. It took him 2 weeks to get a hold of the officers to take his statement (they claimed they lost his number) The assailant ran, the plate number of his car was provided by a witness. They took a statement from the assault but no further follow up and closed the case a year and a 1/2 later with no prosecution.

Dismiss – timeliness.

---

**Received:** Jun 24, 2020 11:45  
**Status:** Active

**Incident summary:**

RP is concerned that on two different occasions he contacted the non-emergency line and got two different answers to his question about reporting two motorhomes that are blocking a pan-handled drive to two apartments. RP feels it is a fire hazard, due to fire equipment not being able to access the property. One call taker refused to forward him to

the fire marshall and another tried to send him to parking services. RP also doesn't believe any report was entered about his concern.

---

**Received:** Jun 25, 2020 13:26

**Status:** Completed Jul 01, 2020

Disposition - Supervisor Review-Closed

**Incident summary:**

RP inquired into whether or not an officer can tell when an inmate is released from jail. RP would like to substantiate whether this person or (others he has given her address to) have been released. RP has a restraining order on a former tenant and needs this information. The officer she spoke with was not forth coming with the information she asked for.

---

**Received:** Jun 30, 2020 09:06

**Status:** Completed Jul 06, 2020

Disposition - Supervisor Review-Closed

**Incident summary:**

RP is upset that EPD did not notify him when a vehicle stolen from his car lot was recovered. He was told by officers that he would be notified so that he could retrieve the vehicle. Instead he received a letter stating it was at a tow facility.

---

**Received:** Jun 30, 2020

**Status:** Completed Jul 06, 2020

Disposition - Supervisor Review-Closed

**Incident summary:**

RP has been unable to get an officer to return his call about a hit and run driver who damaged his bumper. He has left messages various times since 6/19/20. The officer was supposed to call him back after he spoke with the driver.

**Service Complaint: 18 incidents**

## June Closed Cases

### Allegations of Misconduct

Incident Type: IA Investigation  
Received: Mar 23, 2020  
Status: Completed Jun 10, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Allegation of Misconduct/Use of Force  
Disposition - Within Policy

**Incident summary:**

Allegation:

800 Use of Force: It is alleged that Officer A's of force (elbow, hand and arm strikes to the head) during the arrest of a subject for Disorderly Conduct and Criminal Trespass was outside policy.

---

Incident Type: IA Investigation  
Received: Apr 01, 2020  
Status: Completed Jun 29, 2020  
Class/sub-class: Allegation of Misconduct/Performance  
Disposition - Sustained

**Incident summary:**

Allegation:

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

**Allegation of Misconduct: 2 incidents**