

New Complaints and Commendations Overview:

46 complaints opened from
August 1 to August 31:

- 18 Service Complaints
- 14 Inquiries
- 5 Policy Complaints
- 4 Incident Reviews
- 5 Allegations of Misconduct

38 Commendations were
received during this period.



Highlights

- New Complaints **P.1**
- Open and Closed in August **P. 1**
- Additional Opened Cases **P.4**
- New Commendations **P.7**
- Additional Closed Cases **P. 7**
- News Items **P. 11**
- Coming Up **P. 12**

New Complaints

We opened 46 complaints from August 1 to August 31, 2020: 14 Inquiries, 18 Service Complaints, 5 Policy Complaints, 4 Incident Reviews, and 5 Allegations of Misconduct; for a total of 279 complaints so far this year.

As a reminder, the complaints we receive are a first step in a thorough investigative process. Like complaints filed in court, they represent only one side of an interaction. Prior to the investigation, we have no way to discern the accuracy of the information provided in the complaint. What you read here is not necessarily the truth of an incident; it is an introduction to an incident that will be thoroughly investigated. For the purposes of space, the complaint summaries are brief. In particular, inquiries are often used to begin an investigation when the information provided to us from a complainant is limited. Many times inquiries are reclassified.

If a complaint is received that alleges criminal conduct on the part of the employee, the police auditor forwards the complaint and any associated information to the chief of police.

Open and Closed in August

Within the month of August, we opened and closed 14 complaints: 5 Inquiries, 6 Service Complaints, 1 Policy Complaint, and 2 Incident Reviews.

Inquiries:

- 1) RP is concerned about the green City of Eugene vehicle with cameras mounted on the top that is driving around illegally collecting license plates on citizens. RP believes that this is an illegal way to collect a data base on citizens and wants to know what this all about and if EPD is involved.

Summary of Investigation: Incident involved Parking Enforcement, not EPD. Dismissed per Auditor - Outside Jurisdiction.

- 2) RP is unhappy with how officers handled a dispute between her and her ex's mother. The officers harassed and threatened her with jail when it was the other party who initiated the incident.

Summary of Investigation: Incident involved Springfield Police Department employees. Dismissed per Auditor - Outside Jurisdiction.

- 3) An EPD employee notified their supervisor that there was a Facebook post that

City of Eugene



Police Auditor's Office

800 Olive St. Eugene, OR. 97401
541-682-5016



incorrectly implied that the EPD employee refused to wear a mask at Costco.

Summary of Investigation: The supervisor examined the post and accompanying photos and found that the involved person was clearly not the EPD employee (nor any other EPD employee). The supervisor planned to clear the matter up with the person who wrote the post, and also entered the incident into BlueTeam.

4) RP complained that they believed an undercover cop was following him, including waving at him.

Summary of Investigation: Preliminary review determined EPD was not involved. Dismissed per Auditor - Outside Jurisdiction

5) RP reported an incident from 2013 in which he and his girlfriend were both arrested for domestic violence even though he was the victim. RP claimed the officer didn't listen to witnesses nor did they look at security footage from the motel. RP is still upset that this was not addressed.

Summary of Investigation: Dismissed per Auditor - Timeliness.

Service Complaints:

1) RP is concerned that when she tried to report harassment to EPD they would not take the report. RP's boyfriend's parents have attacked her verbally about her mental disability. EPD claims it is a family dispute but another agency would get involved if they saw a report from EPD.

Summary of Investigation: RP did not provide the elements of any crime and the officers determined that this was a civil issue not a criminal

matter. RP was contacted by a supervisor and she understood why this was a civil issue not a criminal matter. RP was provided some options on how she could block unwanted emails or phone calls and she appreciated that. RP expressed her gratitude for the work EPD does.

2) RP is extraordinarily unhappy that when he called EPD to report bike thieves that he was standing right in front of and had admitted stealing the bike, no one was dispatched. RP got the impression that it just wasn't a priority. RP sees EPD having plenty of officers when there is a protest, but not for everyday policing.

Summary of Investigation: There was a special operation during the time RP made the call. Patrol was put on priority calls only with no self-initiated activity. Because the bike was ultimately left behind, the caller was not the victim, the suspects had left, and the license plate information did not return as a valid plate to any vehicles, the dispatcher aired the information to any officer that may be in the area within 6 minutes of the call coming in. Due to the time lapse from when the special operation ended and the call coming in, the dispatcher gave the information to the beat officer. Multiple attempts to get in contact with RP were unsuccessful.

3) Three officers responded to a fight including threats about getting a gun that stemmed from a driving dispute on I-5 just prior to both vehicles arriving at a store. They interviewed the involved parties and uninvolved third-party witnesses and determined all parties had fault such that there was no clear crime unless all involved were charged with Disorderly Conduct. All parties told officers they did not want to press charges, but RP and her acquaintance were not happy with the outcome. All three officers spent some time to answer their questions and further explain their decision. At the end of the contact, RP thanked the officers and left. Later that day, RP called requesting a supervisor. A supervisor called back and spoke to RP who was not satisfied with the resolution at the end of their call and wanted to complain about one of the officers.

Summary of Investigation: A supervisor reviewed the officer's body cam video, observed no misconduct, and found that all three officers tried to patiently explain and answer all the questions. The case was complicated as all involved acted in ways that contributed to the dispute. The officers'

performance was professional and within policy based on the information contained in the video. The supervisor entered the complaint as closed pending further contact with the RP.

- 4) RP is upset that he has been unable to get EPD to enforce the state mask law. RP went to police headquarters to complain that no one will respond to his concern about a neighbor who has held a week-long garage sale with no social distancing or masks. RP spoke with a watch commander who told him they have no authority to enforce this law. RP has spoken with a county commissioner and with the news channels and they all referred him to EPD to get an answer. RP is not satisfied with the information that the watch commander provided and wants to know why EPD is not enforcing the law.

Summary of Investigation: A supervisor made contact with RP and explained that EPD involvement in Social Distance enforcement was subject to triage, and not likely to rise to a high level on most days. RP was upset that he was given different information than he received from another EPD employee. Upon reviewing BWC footage the other EPD employee told RP that the county public health department was in charge of enforcing the Governor's order related to social distancing, and that EPD was not able to enforce it on private property. The EPD employee's information was partially incorrect (regarding enforceability of ORS 401.990). The employee was notified about this partially incorrect information and follow up was made with RP.

- 5) An Anonymous woman left a voice message alleging that she was unlawfully pulled over and detained for no reason by an EPD officer who is being used by the Feds to stalk and harass her. The officer never asked for her license because it wasn't about a traffic stop.

Summary of Investigation: Following review of the incident by the Auditor's Office, dismissed due to no policy violations.

- 6) Anonymous reported an EPD officer who parked his vehicle in one lane of Beltline east to pull someone over, almost causing a pile up of cars.

Summary of Investigation: The positioning of the patrol vehicle was consistent with officer safety practices while conducting traffic stops, particularly on high speed roadways such as Beltline Highway. In addition, the traffic stop only lasted a few

City of Eugene



minutes, with the officer providing quick warning to the offending driver. The officer did not stay at the stop location for any longer than necessary to provide the warning. Due to a lack of contact information for the complainant, no contact was made with him.

Policy Complaint:

- 1) An employee received an email complaining about ongoing prohibited camping and the impacts associated with it.

Summary of Investigation: RP was contacted and was told that response to unhoused campers in public rights of way was being transferred to the Planning and Development Department via Parking Services, and that the area is on EPD's radar. When RP told the supervisor about one of the campers coming into her yard, and having some sort of picture of the fellow, the supervisor invited RP to share the photo with them for follow-up by their staff. RP was given an e-mail and a phone number for this purpose.

Incident Reviews:

- 1) RP alleged that an officer threatened his life and wanted him dead. RP went on to share alleged incidents in which the officer tried to steal a safe from his mother-in-law's property. Two chain saws were alleged to have been taken and during an estate sale the officer was stopped from taking more property than authorized to by a sale representative. RP also stated that the officer threatened to kill him.

Summary of Investigation: The issues of the property do not appear to be criminal in nature based on the information presented. RP advised that the involved officer had never threatened him in person. RP expressed concern about the officer's access to

law enforcement records but did not have any information to believe the officer had utilized any of that information up to this point. The estate sale manager noted that the officer stated something to the effect that RP had been difficult to deal with, 'But you can't kill them...' She said she did not take it as a threat but found the comment to be uncomfortable. Upon reviewing forwarded emails from RP, it appears the family is struggling with communication, and frustration about the management of the estate. The investigation into this incident is recommended to be closed.

- 2) A supervisor received an email from an officer outlining some issues with Officer A regarding overtime and time accounting.

Summary of Investigation: It appears that the employee adjusted their schedule (which they have been allowed to do), and worked the same number of hours they were assigned, ten hours of regular time, and six hours of overtime. The confusion here comes from the fact that the employee appears to be writing their normally assigned shift hours on their timesheet, not the actual times they work. It would be prudent to have the team supervisor involved with the team to help work through these challenges.

Additional Opened Cases

Aside from the 14 complaints received and closed within the month of August, we received an additional 32 complaints in August: 9 Inquiries, 12 Service Complaints, 4 Policy Complaints, 2 Incident Reviews, and 5 Allegations of Misconduct.

Inquiries:

- 1) RP inquired into whether EPD officers have been surveilling his home and taking pictures of license plates of his grandmother and girlfriend. A man claiming to be a private investigator has called his grandmother asking questions about one of his friends who is in jail. Neither RP nor his family knows anything about the issue.
- 2) RP requested to speak with a supervisor regarding a complaint. He advised that his vehicle was damaged after being impounded by police. He said his vehicle was towed, and when he recovered his vehicle from impound, there was significant damage to the interior and exterior. He said he felt the exterior damage was from the tow company, but the tow company denied damaging the interior. RP later sent photographs of the damage. The intake

phone conversation (with an EPD supervisor) was recorded via body camera.

RP was provided Risk Services' phone number and advised his complaint would be documented and looked into.

- 3) An inquiry to examine performance concerns that an officer did not perform the tasks associated with their job description when they failed to retreat as directed and instead remained in position and deployed an OC fogger.
- 4) RP reported an incident in which he heard someone ringing his door bell and pounding on the door and windows of his home. RP tried to ignore it but eventually looked out his window to find a couple of officers who claimed to be doing a welfare check. When he peeked down the stairs of his home two officers were standing at the open door of his home. When he went down to the door he was served papers. The officers had used a ruse of a welfare check to get him to come to the door. They never checked on his welfare and were rude.
- 5) Inquiry regarding officer allegedly striking a male in the face with a PepperBall.
- 6) RP inquired into when her vehicle, which was towed by EPD after a friend was in an accident with it, can be released from evidence. The accident happened on 7/3/20 and she was allowed sometime in July to retrieve personal belongings, but her insurance will not total the vehicle until it is released. In the meantime, she is making payments on it and the officer they have been working with will not give a definite about when it might be released.
- 7) RP alleged an officer assaulted her while on a 911 call.
- 8) RP used EPD's Facebook page to report an alleged off-duty EPD officer who was out of state who made offensive comments about the George Floyd murder. The man also made insensitive and concerning comments about working on protest duty. RP included a first name and location where the comments were made.
- 9) RP called with a concern that when she called in about a family dispute with her brother over him possibly putting a hit out on her husband, the officers turned it into a

domestic violence arrest on her husband. RP did not want to press charges against her husband and felt her rights have been violated.

Service Complaints:

- 1) RPs reported an incident in which officers were called to deal with disorderly neighbors, possibly related to domestic violence. One of the intoxicated people pulled a gun on neighbors and brandished it at them. Both RPs were upset with how the EPD officers who responded handled the incident. Not speaking to all the witnesses, letting the suspects go because he claimed it was a BB gun. Then the officers allowed the intoxicated group to drive away. One RP also noted that when he tried to get officers names he was told they didn't have cards and they did not verbally provide them.
- 2) RP inquired about an EPD incident on his street, and his request for information about the incident.
- 3) Concern about the apparent lack of respect during a discussion between officers referencing a person being struck with a 40 mm sponge round.
- 4) RP is concerned that EPD officers did not contact her daughter (the custodial parent) when they were dispatched to an attempted suicide by her daughter's ex-husband's current wife. RP and her daughter found out about the issue from the children days later and are concerned that they were in danger and were not contacted.
- 5) RP is concerned about the arrest of a homeless man who sleeps (with permission) on the porch of a business next door to her home. Several officers showed up to arrest the man in a manner that, to RP and her neighbors, was quite rough. When they tried to get information from an officer, they were told to get back, he couldn't talk with them right now. After the arrest, the officer just left without an explanation, leaving RP and the neighbors traumatized about what had just happened. RP indicated that a neighbor had video of the incident.
- 6) RP reported an incident from March 2020 in which a newer officer took a damage report on her vehicle. RP's concern is that if the insurance had gone with what the officer had written she would have been out thousands of dollars due to the report being inadequate. RP feels this officer needs more report training.
- 7) RP is upset that a couple of officers rang her doorbell at 3:30am inquiring about a vehicle theft involving someone who may have lived in her home months ago. The officers did not have a vehicle out front making it hard to know if they were even real officers. Once out of their car, the officers were yelling and mocking RP about her reaction to the incident. The event was scary, rude and aggravating.
- 8) RP has reported an ongoing issue with a neighbor making loud noise with parties and public drunkenness at all hours of the day and night. Regardless of the many times RP has called in about the issue, or the details RP provides to dispatch, to RP's knowledge no fine or citation has ever been given to these offenders.
- 9) RP believes there is a miscommunication between officers and the Saturday Market permit people which is leading to him being harassed by officers and made to move. RP was given a warning to move from near Lucky's on Olive where he was selling wares, by officers. What is on his paperwork and what is on the internet is different, but no one answers when he tries to have the Saturday Market back him up, and officers didn't believe him that he should be able to sell at this spot.
- 10) RP is upset that when two officers responded to her call for service about a homeless woman who has been wailing at the top of her lungs for 4 days near her home, they flipped the issue on to her. RP feels she has a valid complaint and would have liked to have action against the noise ordinance she was reporting. As far as RP knows, no enforcement action was taken.
- 11) A communications supervisor spoke with RP, who was concerned about how their call for service was handled when they were assaulted by a customer while at work. RP was concerned that the call taker seemed more focused on whether RP wanted to press charges rather than just sending officers. The supervisor reviewed the incident and spoke with the involved employee.
- 12) RP and others are concerned about a reply that was made to a community member on EPD's Facebook page. The community member

asked if it was okay for a citizen to jump in and help an officer if the officer clearly needed help. The reply was yes, if the officer knows you are helping and that it is important to follow the officer's directions. RPs believe in today's climate this was welcoming trouble, due to all the folks out there with guns excited to have an excuse to use them. They believe the social media manager did a poor job of communicating with their community.

Policy Complaints:

- 1) RP inquired with a local university about their response to a supposed protest over the cross on their property. The pastor explained to her via email that they had conferred with EPD and had been told to hire private security. RP was concerned that this advice led to hundreds of people on the property, many with assault rifles, and including a white supremacy organization. RP is concerned about the safety issue that this caused to the area which is next to a park full of children.
- 2) RP expressed concern that a young woman had been lured to police headquarters and arrested for rioting. RP is opposed to this type of police action and would like this investigated.
- 3) RP emailed with concerns about EPD charging people with incidents related to the protests, and more specifically that EPD had put this information on their Facebook page.
- 4) RP is concerned that the ORS that prohibits camping in the high-water line along the river in Eugene is not being enforced. There is a small piece of property owned by ODOT on the bike path near Valley River Inn that is full of tents and trash. RP has complained about this area in the past, but it is still occurring.

Incident Reviews:

- 1) An incident review to examine the use of body worn cameras to determine if policy was followed; may be reclassified to allegations against specific employees of violation of Body-Worn Camera policy.
- 2) EPD received an email regarding EPD's treatment of an inmate who alleged that she was trying to report an assault when she was arrested by EPD for disorderly conduct.

Incident review pending possible reclassification to an Allegation of Misconduct, per Auditor.

Allegation of Misconduct:

- 1) Allegation: 103.5.8 Courtesy: It is alleged that Supervisor A used profanity when interacting with the public in violation of policy.
- 2) RP called to complain about how a situation with her schizophrenic son was handled. RP tried to have CAHOOTS dispatched to help deal with her son and was told that the situation she described (her son had a knife) would require police to respond as well. Cahoots was not allowed into the house to help deal with her son, which frustrated them also. Once she was allowed back in her home after several hours there was signs of an altercation, blood on her sofa and taser wires strewn about. Her son was then charged and taken to jail. 820.3 POLICY: Officers should make every reasonable effort to de-escalate confrontations to prevent the need to use force. When a subject's actions create an imminent threat to the public or to officers, it is expected that officers will respond with reasonable and decisive force. 1. 820.3 De-escalation: That Supervisor A failed to make reasonable efforts to de-escalate a confrontation to prevent the need to use force.
- 3) RP reported unnecessary force used against her daughter during a protest. RP's daughter went to the protest and came upon a group of officers standing in a line, her daughter was standing with her hands up and shouting and was pushed to the ground twice without provocation. They were not in a crowd of people and were not doing anything wrong. RP is able to provide a video of the event. 800.2.2: That Officer A used force in excess of that which was reasonably necessary during his encounter with the reporting party's daughter.
- 4) RPs complained about an officer apparently throwing a tear gas cannister at a reporter. the circumstances when they hit a person with a tear gas canister.

5) As to Officer A:

1. 800 Use of Force: That Officer A used force in excess of that which was reasonably necessary under the totality of the circumstances when they fired hundreds of PepperBall rounds into crowds of demonstrators.
2. 804 Pepperball Projectiles: That Officer A used PepperBall projectiles under conditions where they could affect innocent bystanders.
3. 800 Use of Force: That Officer A used force in excess of that which was reasonably necessary under the totality of the circumstances when they fired PepperBall rounds at a demonstrator.

As to Officer B:

1. 800 Use of Force: That Officer B used force in excess of that which was reasonably necessary under the totality of the circumstances when they fired hundreds of PepperBall rounds into crowds of demonstrators.
2. 804 PepperBall Projectiles: That Officer B used PepperBall projectiles under conditions where they could affect innocent bystanders.

New Commendations

There were 38 commendations documented, during the month of August for a 2020 total of 257 so far. Most commendations are made through EPD. The Auditor's office accepts commendations as well.

Commendations are listed on the Police Department website at:

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

Additional Closed Cases

Aside from the 14 complaints received and closed within the month of August, we closed an additional 20 complaints: 6 Inquiries, 5 Service Complaints, 6 Policy Complaints, and 3 Incident Reviews.

Closed Inquiries:

- 1) RP wrote and called with her concerns about clearing the campers at Washington-Jefferson park.

Summary of Investigation: RP told the contacting supervisor that she "didn't fault the police, but those giving commands". She added she made the complaint to the Police Auditor because she didn't know, or think, Parks had a mechanism to file a complaint. The supervisor discussed EPD's role in assisting Parks in cleaning sites and shared that officers are typically there to ensure the safety of parks staff. The supervisor offered to connect her with a Parks and Open Spaces manager who she might discuss her concerns with; she was agreeable to the offer.

- 2) RP has been having difficulties with her downstairs neighbor. They have filed complaints with the apartment manager and have had officers at her apartment regarding this issue. The officers have told them that there is nothing that can be done, and the people have the right to say what they want. These issues have been going on for a year.

Summary of Investigation: The investigation found multiple calls for service from RP which resulted in no action taken due to no probable cause. An officer advised both should consider looking into a protective order and continue to document and collect evidence to support each of their allegations. A supervisor contacted RP, and discovered there is now a protective order in place and RP will continue to document evidence and contact police if the need arises.

- 3) RP listed a couple of complaints on a complaint form. 1. RP wants EPD to get involved in getting her ex-husband a handgun that he left in an unlocked car on her property. The ex has been harassing and stalking her. From the narrative it is unclear whether EPD has been involved up to this point. 2. RP alleges that EPD stalked and harassed her acting with prejudice, predatory and violated her rights.

Summary of Investigation: In the complaint, RP admits to Theft 1 by knowingly withholding property from her ex and the second portion of her complaint is unfounded and contains several verifiable lies. RP appears to be suffering from some mental health issues and lied to officers. There is no further action

necessary; the complaint is unfounded and can be considered closed.

- 4) RP has an issue with the animal control officer coming back and telling them that an issue from months back which had been resolved is now going to get her a citation. RP's dog had killed a neighbor's chicken.

Summary of Investigation: RP had been given warnings for a prior incident involving her dog. After a fourth incident with her dog, she was given a citation. RP was under the impression that the citation was for the initial complaint that she felt was resolved, and it was. A supervisor spoke with RP and let her know that they understand how she might have been confused on the "retro" citation but clarified that the citation was from the most recent incident and not the original one. RP stated that her dog won't be an issue any longer as she had to be "put down" due to health issues. RP thanked the supervisor for calling her and following up and felt things were clarified and resolved.

- 5) RP emailed a concern about an officer who did not do their job in a courteous manner when RP tried to report an issue with harassment at work (threatening to kill him) over Covid issues. The officer read him the Oregon harassment statute but did not take a report. RP also noted the officer was awkward and unprofessional.

Summary of Investigation: A supervisor attempted several phone calls to RP without success. This complaint is considered closed.

- 6) RP is concerned that two EPD officers were on her porch shining flashlights around their home and their vehicle parked out front at 0300. The officers did not knock or acknowledge their presence. RP feels this may be to harass them because they belong to one of the protest groups.

Summary of Investigation: Officers were dispatched to the area after a 911 hang up call for a welfare check. Officers mistakenly approached RP's house, but once they shone a light on her front porch and realized the wrong address, they left. Officers did look into a parked car and knocked on RP's house prior to realizing their mistake.

Closed Service Complaints:

- 1) Complaint about an officer not wearing a mask during a traffic stop.

Summary of Investigation: RP was advised that a supervisor would speak with the officers about using PPE when contacting the public. RP appreciated the call and conversation. The officers understood and agreed to wear their masks when safe to do so while interacting with the public.

- 2) RP was forwarded to the Auditor's Office with a concern about the aggressive bums that are roaming through the 55 and older complex he manages.

Summary of Investigation: A supervisor attempted to contact RP multiple times. There was no answer and a voicemail was left with contact information. The supervisor searched agency records and found RP had placed twenty-two calls for service throughout the city during the 2020 calendar year. Although unable to speak with RP, the supervisor concluded there is no policy violation as it relates to his complaint regarding a lack of police response and his frustration with the "auditor system." Additionally, it is obvious his complaint is directly attributed to a lack of resources and not the behavior of any specific officer.

- 3) RP reported two officers in a vehicle who were not social distancing and had their masks pulled down on their chins.

Summary of Investigation: A supervisor called RP back to speak with him about the incident, however he refused to speak on it and said to "let it go". The supervisor also reminded the officers of the Deputy Chief's direction to wear masks when working in a vehicle with another officer.

- 4) RP emailed the Mayor and City Council stating that an officer was discourteous to him because he was wearing a BLM shirt.

Summary of Investigation: A supervisor emailed RP and asked for a call back to discuss this matter; RP never made contact.

- 5) RP reported an EPD vehicle driving 20 miles an hour over the speed limit.

Summary of Investigation: AVL information was requested for the identified officer. The speed limit in the streets RP mentioned is 30-35. AVL information shows speeds at 54 and 56. The officer claimed to have been heading back to Headquarters to report to court. Given this is the first complaint of this type for this officer, expectations going forward have been documented.

Closed Policy Complaints:

- 1) RP expressed concerns about officers not wearing face masks and not social distancing.

Summary of Investigation: RP was sent an email requesting that she call a supervisor to talk about her concern. RP has yet to make contact with the supervisor.

- 2) RP is concerned about the protesters blocking streets, causing fear for their safety, belongings and property to residents of the city. Blocking the roads also causes emergency vehicles to be delayed. Detour signs need to be used when roads are inaccessible. One group is being allowed to cause this much disruption, please do something for Eugene residents who are paying taxes.

Summary of Investigation: A supervisor sent an acknowledgment letter to RP and requested a phone number or email address if he wished to discuss this matter further.

- 3) RP emailed the mayor and Council with concerns about EPD officers setting up an "entrapment area" in the construction area west of Coburg on I-105. RP also notes poor police service in the Whit.

Summary of Investigation: After reviewing the complaint through Blue Team, a supervisor responded to the complainant via email as RP did not provide a phone number to contact him. The supervisor explained the traffic patterns and speed zone RP was referencing was set by ODOT.

- 4) RP is concerned that EPD's policy of educating and not citing regarding illegal fireworks is not

working. Once again, this year, RP's neighborhood sounded like a war zone. RP believes that the only way to notify every citizen about what is legal, is to send out a flyer; just putting it in the Register Guard is not getting the job done.

Summary of Investigation: Attempts to make contact with RP were unsuccessful after a number registered to her in CAD was no longer in service. EPD receives a high volume of calls for service each year throughout the city leading up to and on the 4th of July. This makes it difficult even for the dedicated fireworks enforcement officers to respond to all calls for service 911 receives. The officers have been given the discretion to issue citation or give warning and provide education during these types of events. EPD will take these suggestions and work to determine if there are different avenues of education they can take to get the word out to the public in a more efficient manner and more frequently prior to the 4th of July.

- 5) RP is concerned about a homeless camp at the end of Empire Park Drive.

Summary of Investigation: A supervisor contacted RP and learned that no campers were present at the site any longer. RP had also built a better fence to ensure safety and privacy for his family.

- 6) RP is concerned that there isn't a call line or easy way to report vehicles that have expired tags so that enforcement can take place. EPD told her that they don't follow up on this unless they pull someone over, in which case they could cite the person.

Summary of Investigation: RP was told about EPD's staffing, and the difficulty with trying to follow up on minor things like an equipment violation. RP seemed to understand the challenges. She asked the supervisor a couple other questions about other issues which they also discussed. The conversation was pleasant, and she seemed content with the contact and explanation.

Closed Incident Reviews:

- 1) 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 march.

Summary of Investigation: The investigation failed to uncover any evidence to support the allegations that the Eugene Police failed to conduct a full and thorough investigation into this incident. This incident was afforded substantially more investigative resources than an allegation of a minor injury Hit and Run would generally receive. After reviewing police reports from the initial responding officers, the supervisor agrees with their assessment that no Probable Cause existed to arrest the driver for any crimes, and therefore it would've been unlawful to place him under arrest. The complete and thorough criminal investigation was completed and was subjected to a full review by the Lane County District Attorney as well as a Grand Jury. Ultimately it was determined there remained insufficient evidence to charge the driver for any crimes stemming from this incident. Despite this fact, EPD did eventually issue the driver non-criminal traffic citations as a result of his driving during this incident.

- 2) RP is concerned that EPD did nothing to stop the vandalizing of his business, while employees feared for their safety inside. The police just watched, no arrests were made, and rioters were allowed to continue on their way causing more damage.

Summary of Investigation: EPD officers were severely outnumbered and were dealing with an unpredictable crowd who was overtly hostile and intent on causing damage and disruption in the city. Once it was determined there was an immediate need to intervene at the business to ensure the safety of the employees trapped inside, an EPD Field Force contingent was on scene in approximately two minutes. By that time, most of the crowd was already moving away from the restaurant and toward the Federal Courthouse. The Field Force contingent was able to clear the parking lot around the business, and the employees were able to safely evacuate approximately six minutes after the crowd first amassed at the location. Field Force officers intended on making arrests of

individuals at the location if it was safe to do so but were soon pulled from the location by the Watch Commander to assist with the unruly crowd lighting fires at the Federal Courthouse. As a result, no enforcement action was immediately taken at the business. While it is certainly unfortunate and undoubtedly frustrating that a riotous crowd damaged RP's business, there is no evidence that EPD officers failed to take reasonable steps to protect life and property under the difficult circumstances they encountered.

- 3) RP reported an incident in which officers declined to render aid to a protester who was having a seizure when asked by other protesters.

Summary of Investigation: EPD learned there was a report of a protester suffering a seizure within the group. Dispatch was immediately notified of the reported emergency, but it was noted that Eugene Fire/EMS would not respond into an angry crowd under the circumstances. Field force officers instructed the protestors to have the patient moved out of the crowd to a nearby intersection so medics could respond to offer aid. Within two minutes, a supervisor exited their unmarked car and contacted the patient. The supervisor advised the patient was away from the crowd and determined it was reasonably safe for medics to respond to the patient. "Code three" medics were called to the location. The supervisor advised the patient had recovered from the seizure and didn't want medical assistance. A short time later (not listed in CAD) the patient suffered another seizure. Medics continued to the location, and the supervisor advised Eugene Fire/EMS was on scene and conducting a medical evaluation on the patient. A few minutes later the supervisor advised the patient declined further medical assistance, and that units were clear from the call.

News Items

Louisville's Police Force Feels Besieged on Two Fronts: Officers say that city and police officials were slow to release crucial details in the Breonna Taylor case. Protesters are fed up with what they consider abusive tactics.

Calm seems a long way off.

<https://www.nytimes.com/2020/09/24/us/louisville-police-protests.html>

As tensions rise between police and the public, more officers seeking mental health assistance

<https://www.pix11.com/news/america-in-crisis/as-tensions-rise-between-police-and-the-public-more-officers-seeking-mental-health-assistance>

Baltimore County launches interactive policing data dashboard

<https://www.wbaltv.com/article/baltimore-county-interactive-policing-data-dashboard/34162331#>

About Us

The Office of the Police Auditor operates independently. We report directly to, and are funded by, the Eugene City Council. We are an independent, civilian entity Responsible for civilian oversight of the Eugene Police Department; neither our funding nor management overlap with EPD.

City of Eugene Office of the Police Auditor

800 Olive St.
Eugene, OR 97401

Mark Gissiner,
Police Auditor

Leia Pitcher,
Deputy Police Auditor

Vicki Cox,
Senior Program Coordinator

Beatriz Otero Hernandez,
Community Engagement Coordinator &
Translation Specialist

Phone: (541) 682-5016

Fax: (541) 682-5599

Email:
policeauditor@eugene-or.gov

Website:
<http://www.eugene-or.gov/policeauditor>

Facebook:
www.facebook.com/EugenePoliceAuditor

Twitter:
[@Eugene_IPA](https://twitter.com/Eugene_IPA)

City of Eugene



Coming Up

Due to the public health concerns, we are not accepting walk-ins at this time. Staff from our office continue to intake complaints and commendations from the public. Please continue to contact our office by:

- Visiting our website at www.eugene-or.gov/PoliceAuditor
- Calling us at 541-682-5016
- Emailing us: policeauditor@eugene-or.gov
- Filling out our complaint form located to the right of our door and placing through the mail slot

In addition, we will be holding our next Civilian Review Board meeting virtually via Zoom. Please follow our social media pages for more information on how to access the meeting and provide public comment.