



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, September 12, 2023 – 5:30pm

Attend Via Webinar: <https://eugene-or-gov.zoom.us/j/83533121612>

Passcode: CRB92023

Attend by Phone: 833 548 0276 (US Toll Free)

Attend in Person: 101 East Broadway Suite 230 Eugene, OR 97401

<u>Item</u>	<u>Time (Starting)</u>
1. Agenda and Materials Review	5 minutes (5:30pm)
2. Minutes Approval (Minutes from June meeting)	5 minutes (5:35pm)
3. Comments from Board Members and Commission Liaisons	5 minutes (5:40pm)
4. Public Comment	5 minutes (5:45pm)
5. Training Topic:	15 minutes (5:50pm)
6. Break	5 minutes (6:05pm)
7. Case Review: Constitutional Rights, Conduct, Performance, Courtesy	45 minutes (6:10pm)
8. Auditor Report	10 minutes (6:55pm)
9. Closing Comments	15 minutes (7:05pm)
10. Adjourn	(7:20pm)

Upcoming Meeting:
October 10, 2023

MINUTES
Civilian Review Board
Zoom Webinar

June 13, 2023
5:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Carolyn Williams, Chair; Jose Cortez, Vice Chair; Bernadette Conover; Rick Roseta; Alan Leiman; Clay Neal; Monique Griffin; Rob Eller; Lindsey Foltz; Leia Pitcher; Cindy Coleman.

ABSENT: There were no absent members.

Chair Williams convened the Civilian Review Board (CRB) at 5:30 p.m. The Land Acknowledgement was read, and a quorum was established.

1. Agenda and Materials Review

There were no changes made to the agenda.

2. Minutes Approval (Minutes from May 9, 2023, Meeting)

Conover stated that the minutes should reflect the Vice Chair as Jose Cortez, not Alan Leiman.

MOTION: Neal moved, seconded by Conover, to approve the May 9, 2023, CRB meeting minutes with amendment. The motion passed unanimously – 6:0.

3. Comments from Board Members and Commission Liaisons

Conover noted that Pride, Flag Day, and Juneteenth were celebrated this month.

Neal said that they attended the Human Rights Commission meeting last month, and that they did not get to participate in discussions.

Leiman said the police commission's two-year work plan would be presented to city council soon. A few of the top priorities listed in the plan were virtual policing, the discipline matrix, and performance evaluations.

There were no other comments.

4. Public Comment

Ricky Collin said they attended the Eugene Police Policy Commission meeting last week, where they brought to attention several officers violating multiple policies. They noted that they also told the police auditor's office, the sheriff's office, and the Eugene Police Department (EPD) about the violations, and that they had received nothing but rejections despite the blatant violations of law and policy committed by EPD officers. They noted that when they emailed the police chief about their concerns, they received three pornographic videos from them in response.

There were no other comments.

5. Intake Review: Dismissed After Preliminary Investigation

Summary of Facts

Eller said that a reporting person (RP) submitted an incident report in which their doctor called in a welfare check. The RP complained that four armed officers, a medical staff member, and CAHOOTS arrived at their residence and that their cul-de-sac was blocked off. The RP was detained and coerced into having their home searched. The RP's complaints were reviewed by the police auditor's office, and it was determined that no policy violations were made. The complaint was dismissed.

Conover said they appreciated the chance to review this case, which showcased two different EPD interactions with the same person in a twelve-hour span of time. They noted that the EPD reacted to the RP in a calm and caring manner.

Leiman stated they had empathy for the RP, who was clearly in distress.

Vice Chair Cortez said they wanted the people of Eugene to know that the auditor's office took these types of complaints seriously. They empathized with the RP, but the EPD de-escalated the situation appropriately.

Chair Williams said it was important to note that the auditor's office looked at everything when reviewing cases.

Griffin noted that even though this case was dismissed, it did not prevent the auditor's office from reviewing the relevant information.

Rosetta said they appreciated the way Vicki Cox spoke to the RP during their phone call and that EPD officers responded to this situation in an empathetic and appropriate manner.

Foltz said the auditor's office worked diligently to find supporting evidence for all complaints.

There were no other comments or questions.

Chair Williams called for a five-minute break.

6. Break

The CRB took a break from 5:55 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.

7. Case Review: Vehicle Pursuit, Foot Pursuit, Taser Policy

Eller said this case review entailed allegations of an improper vehicle pursuit, foot pursuit, and taser use.

Summary of Facts

While on patrol in an EPD vehicle, officer A saw who they believed to be a person with a felony warrant for a firearms offense operating a vehicle. Officer A attempted to stop the suspect, but they did not stop. Other officers were called to assist. Before other officer's arrived on the scene, officer A found the suspect, who then fled the scene on foot. Officer A was able to catch the suspect on foot. Upon catching the suspect, Officer A realized the suspect was not the person with a felony warrant. Office A proceeded to arrest the person for fleeing the scene, but they did not obey EPD commands. As a result, officer A drew their firearm in one hand and their taser in the other. The person became combative and threw a

deck chair at officer A. The taser was used on the person twice, and with assistance from other officers, the person was taken into custody.

During their Internal Affairs, (IA) interview, officer A acknowledged they engaged in a vehicle pursuit, stated that the foot pursuit was justified, said they deployed their firearm and taser because of the threat the person presented, and that the second taser deployment was necessary.

Allegations

- 814.2.1 Vehicle Pursuit Policy – Officer A violated this policy when they engaged in a vehicle pursuit despite the fact that the suspect was not engaged in the commission of or the attempt to commit a violent felony, and the pursuit was not authorized.
- 809.2.g Use of Taser Policy – Officer A held a firearm and a taser at the same time when lethal force was not justified.
- 809.4.3 Use of Taser Policy – Officer A repeatedly discharged their taser on the suspect in violation of policy.
- 458.3 Foot Pursuit – Officer A continued to pursue the suspect on foot when officer A was acting alone, and exigency did not require it.

Adjudication Recommendations

- Vehicle Pursuit – Sustained by the Auditor, EPD Chain of Command, and the EPD Chief
- Use of Taser – Sustained by the Auditor, EPD Chain of Command, and the EPD Chief
- Use of Taser – Sustained by the Auditor, EPD Chain of Command, and the EPD Chief
- Foot Pursuit – Within Policy by the Auditor, EPD Chain of Command, and the EPD Chief

Eller noted this was an internal complaint and listed the following materials provided to the CRB for review:

- In car camera video, body-worn camera video, and photographs,
- IA report detailing the investigation process,
- all correspondence related to the complaint, including internal correspondence,
- adjudication recommendation memo from the chain of command,
- adjudication from the auditor,
- adjudication memo from the chief,
- all related reports and records,
- Relevant EPD policies.

The board discussed the complaint intake, classification, and monitoring.

Neal said they did not have a problem with how the intake was handled, and the classification seemed reasonable to them. Based on the materials provided, it seemed like a well-monitored investigation.

Leiman noted it would be helpful if the auditor's office could provide pointers to relevant information and said it was difficult to find the moment in the video where the taser was used.

Vice Chair Cortez said the classification seemed straight forward. There was not much to comment on regarding the intake and monitoring.

Chair Williams agreed with Vice Chair Cortez and said the intake, classification, and monitoring were well done. They stated the reason why the auditor's office did not point out specific details in a case was because doing so could be misconceived by the public.

Neal said given the fact that the board were all volunteers, it would be helpful to streamline the review process. They suggested a table of contents or a naming convention for provided files would be helpful.

Foltz said chapter and verse were provided in the IA report.

Chair Williams said Officer A seemed to have a hero complex, which was concerning. Officer A went into detail regarding their intent to ensure the community was safe. They had imaginative ideas about what could or would have happened. Officer A was trying to use evidence that had nothing to do with the case. Their remarks seemed disingenuous and a bit like they were gaslighting the IA investigator. Chair Williams hoped not all EPD officers had hero complexes and that was not the culture of the EPD.

Griffin concurred with Chair Williams. They asked if officers were allowed to seek assistance when writing their reports or if that was an independent effort.

Coleman said officers wrote their reports independently, but that they were approved by their supervisor. The supervisor could request additional information from officers, if needed.

Griffin said officer A stated that they kicked and hit the suspect with focused strikes, which did not seem warranted because the suspect was facing officer A and on the ground at the time. In their report, officer A repeatedly stated the phrase, "in my experience, this could have resulted in X, Y, or Z", as a justification for their reactions. Griffin was disappointed that the auditor's office did not include those uses of force in their classifications.

Pitcher said focused kicks and hits were considered low-level uses of force and not outside of EPD policy.

Griffin acknowledged that they had a guttural reaction when watching the focused strikes because they were not accustomed to that type of behavior. Despite that, it seemed the uses of force were not appropriate, even though they were considered low-level.

Rosetta agreed with Leiman's comments regarding pointers to relevant information from the auditor's office. They said the intake, classification, and monitoring were done well.

Conover noted that officer A had only been on the force for three years. Regarding pointers to relevant information from the auditor's office, Conover said board members could be pointed in the right direction by reading the IA report before watching the supporting videos. They agreed with Griffin's points about the focused strikes. Conover said the intake and classification were good and appreciated the IA report.

Leiman said pursuits should be avoided, but noted certain conditions required them to occur. There seemed to be a concerted, demonstrated effort to force them to occur within the EPD. Regarding officer A drawing their handgun and taser at the same time, it was apparent that EPD officers were trained not to do that based off documented comments made by other officers in the supporting materials.

Vice Chair Cortez said officer A displayed a lack of accountability during their IA interview. The reason given for the pursuit was that the suspect was putting themselves in a deadly situation. Officer A seemed to feel their way through this situation as opposed to thinking their way through it.

Chair Williams said mental health training was important to help tightly wound EPD officers refrain from uses of force. Though the suspect was not the warranted felon officer A thought they were, the suspect broke the law when they ran from officer A. It could have all been prevented if they did not run.

Griffin said they were satisfied with the classification. As Leiman pointed out, certain training was referred to by other officers in the report and not that long ago, the deputy chief said that officers were being trained on the pursuit policy quarterly. Griffin said it would be beneficial for the board to know more about the non-deadly use of force policy, i.e., pain, compliance, and when it was appropriate to administer certain types of force. She did not think the level of aggressiveness displayed by officer A should be policy or part of EPD training.

Pitcher said Deputy Chief Adams wanted to provide a non-deadly force training for the board, but noted it was a hands-on training.

Griffin said they would not be interested in participating in a hands-on training but would like to see a PowerPoint presentation of the training.

Conover said the entire EPD did not need to be trained if one officer fell out of line with their training and reiterated that officer A was relatively new to the force and had a lack of experience.

Coleman said every use of force got reviewed and the department always looked for examples to use in trainings. Trends within the department were recognized and training was given to the entire department, if needed. Training opportunities could be identified even if the use of force was within policy.

Pitcher said officer A put themselves in an unsafe situation by going on the foot pursuit alone. Clearly that was an issue that needed to be addressed.

Neal said it seemed that overarching training entailed both fear and action. There had to be a balance to ensure officers were safe and reacting appropriately to threats, but at the same time, not overreacting to threats. Training had to be coupled with reasoning or experience. This case presented an opportunity to look at the training for threat response and how to develop a mature sense of reasoning.

All board members agreed with the adjudications.

There were no other comments or questions.

8. Auditor Annual Report

Pitcher said 33 complaints were received, there was 15 uses of force, and one vehicle pursuit in May 2023. There had been 10 vehicle pursuits so far this year. The annual report was completed and presented to city council. Pitcher would meet with city council on June 14, 2023, to discuss possible improvements to the oversight system. Pitcher noted that no changes had been made to the oversight system since 2007. Foltz and Eller were appointed as associate auditors. Pitcher signed their contract as auditor with the City of Eugene.

Pitcher said the Auditor Annual Report was posted on the City of Eugene website. There were 262 investigated complaints and 71 dismissed complaints. Though there were fewer complaints than the

previous year, the auditor's office investigated more specific allegations. The two highest allegations of misconduct were regarding performance and judgement policies. Overall, most of the allegations were sustained. Seven employees received documented counseling for sustained violations, two employees received written reprimand, two employees received oral reprimand, one employee retired prior to corrective action, and two employees received coaching. Administrative outcomes included the following:

- Accessibility
- Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion
- Core Competencies
- Outreach
- Ongoing Collaboration and Improvement

There were no comments or questions.

9. Closing Comments

Chair Williams told board members to let them know if there were any cases they would like to discuss at the next meeting. They reiterated that non-lethal use of force training was on the list of trainings the board was interested in.

Griffin was happy Lea Pitcher became the permanent auditor, and that Lindsey Foltz, and Rob Eller were named as associate auditors. They were also glad that Carolyn Williams and Jose Cortez would be returning to the CRB for another term.

Conover noted the CRB used to have joint meetings with the police commission.

Pitcher offered to reach out to police commission staff to inquire about doing that again in the future.

Regarding tactfully addressing public comments, Conover suggested stating that board members may offer a response during closing comments prior to opening the floor to the public.

Chair Williams agreed it would be tactful to have a script developed and noted it should include the fact that board members would not be allowed to discuss the case specifically.

Neal asked if there was a closed case related to the public comments made tonight.

Pitcher said yes, but it was most likely from a few years ago. They agreed a script for opening public comments would be great.

Leiman stated that at the last police commission meeting, there was an effort to put Ricky Collin in contact with the auditor's office. Unrelated, they said to have a truly robust oversight system, there had to be a connection between the process and the outcome. It was worth noting that the department was responsible for making the discipline decisions, but the decisions were kept secret. It was important for the public to know that this process lacked a certain element of transparency regarding discipline.

Vice Chair Cortez was about to ask about the email allegations made against the police chief by tonight's public speaker when Foltz chimed in about the issue.

Foltz said investigating the actions of the police chief was not in the purview of the auditor's office. That would fall under the city manager's purview. Complaints arriving in the auditor's office about the chief would be dismissed for being outside of their jurisdiction.

Vice Chair Cortez said when public comments entail allegations against the chief, it would be appropriate to state that the chief's actions were outside of the auditor's jurisdiction during closing comments.

Chair Williams said Leiman's comments about the importance of transparency regarding disciplinary actions were completely appropriate. There was nothing wrong with discussing beneficial changes to the oversight system.

Leiman noted Pitcher would meet with city council on June, 14, 2023, to discuss possible changes within the oversight system.

Conover said the purpose of the auditor's office and the CRB was to review conduct. When the board looked at discipline, it went beyond what the community voted for with regard to the oversight system.

Pitcher said the system does what it set out to do very well, in their opinion.

There were no other comments.

10. Adjourn

Chair Williams adjourned the meeting at 7:27 p.m.

(Minutes recorded by Diana Pamir Tisdale)

Office of the Police Auditor
June 2023 Open Case Report

Inquiries

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Jun 2, 2023
Class/sub-class: Inquiry
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP questioned what actions constituted a crime.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Jun 2, 2023
Class/sub-class: Inquiry
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP complained that he/she has not been able to get a copy of a police report.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Jun 8, 2023
Class/sub-class: Inquiry
Disposition:

RP complained a request for service was mishandled.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Jun 8, 2023
Class/sub-class: Inquiry
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP alleged an investigation was mishandled and substandard.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Jun 9, 2023
Class/sub-class: Inquiry
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP complained officer response to call for service was slow and insufficient.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Jun 12, 2023
Class/sub-class: Inquiry
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP alleged officers mishandled an investigation and lacked courtesy.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Jun 12, 2023
Class/sub-class: Inquiry
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP complained officers improperly handled a call for service.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Jun 12, 2023
Class/sub-class: Inquiry
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP complained officers mishandled an investigation.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Jun 12, 2023
Class/sub-class: Inquiry
Disposition: Dismissed-o/s jurisdiction

RP complained officers mishandled an investigation.
Dismiss - outside jurisdiction/agency.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Jun 20, 2023
Class/sub-class: Inquiry
Disposition: Dismissed-o/s jurisdiction

RP complained police officers acted improperly.
Dismiss - outside jurisdiction/agency.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Jun 21, 2023
Class/sub-class: Inquiry
Disposition:

RP complained officers were discourteous and acted improperly.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Jun 22, 2023
Class/sub-class: Inquiry
Disposition:

RP complained regarding a disparity in police response to calls for service.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Jun 23, 2023
Class/sub-class: Inquiry
Disposition: Dismissed-o/s jurisdiction

RP complained that a civilian engaged in unlawful behavior.
Dismiss - not an EPD employee.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Jun 26, 2023
Class/sub-class: Inquiry
Disposition: Dismissed-o/s jurisdiction

RP complained officers mishandled property.
Dismiss - outside agency.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Jun 30, 2023
Class/sub-class: Inquiry
Disposition:

RP complained officers failed to respond properly to a restraining order enforcement request.

Service Complaints

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Jun 1, 2023
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Courtesy
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP complained an officer mishandled an investigation.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Jun 5, 2023
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Service level
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP complained he/she received substandard police service.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Jun 9, 2023
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Conduct
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP complained an officer speeds while driving his/her personal car.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Jun 16, 2023
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP complained an officer mishandled an investigation.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Jun 21, 2023
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP complained EPD employees acted improperly.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Jun 22, 2023
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Courtesy
Disposition: Dismissed - EE Not Active

RP complained an officer's behavior was substandard.
Dismiss - officer no longer employed by EPD.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Jun 23, 2023

Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Courtesy
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP complained police response to a call for service was untimely and officers lacked courtesy.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Jun 23, 2023
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance
Disposition:

RP complained an officer improperly handled a call for service and expressed the need for additional police training.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Jun 26, 2023
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP complained his/her identity was improperly disclosed to a suspect of an investigation.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Jun 28, 2023
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Courtesy
Disposition: Dismissed-Other

RP complained an officer mishandled an animal abuse allegation.
Dismiss - no policy violations.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Jun 29, 2023
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance
Disposition:

RP complained an officer improperly said he/she (RP) engaged in criminal activity.

Policy Complaints

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Jun 22, 2023
Class/sub-class: Policy Complaint
Disposition:

RP complained officers mishandled an investigation.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Jun 29, 2023
Class/sub-class: Policy Complaint
Disposition:

RP requested information regarding an EPD policy.

Incident Reviews

Incident type: Incident Review
Status: Completed

Received date: Jun 13, 2023
Class/sub-class: Incident Review / Conduct
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP alleged an officer had bias and acted improperly.

Incident type: Incident Review
Status: Active
Received date: Jun 18, 2023
Class/sub-class: Incident Review / Performance
Disposition:

RP complained officers failed to perform their duties, failed to request medical assistance, and acted improperly.

Allegations of Criminal Conduct

Incident type: IA Investigation
Status: Completed
Received date: Jun 29, 2023
Class/sub-class: Allegation of Criminal Conduct / Conduct
Disposition: Dismissed-previously reviewed

RP alleged an officer engaged in criminal activity.

Incident type: IA Investigation
Status: Completed
Received date: May 19, 2023
Class/sub-class: Allegation of Criminal Conduct / Conformance to Laws
Disposition: Administratively Closed

RP alleged officers engaged in criminal activity 15-20 years ago. RP discontinued contact with investigators. [Administratively closed - investigation will be reopened for review pending new information.]

Office of the Police Auditor
July 2023 Open Case Report

Inquiries

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Jul 5, 2023
Class/sub-class: Inquiry
Disposition:

RP complained communication specialists and officers provided substandard service.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Jul 5, 2023
Class/sub-class: Inquiry
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP complained officers failed to fairly enforce laws/ordinances.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Jul 26, 2023
Class/sub-class: Inquiry
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP complained a request for service was ignored for several days and mishandled.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Jul 27, 2023
Class/sub-class: Inquiry
Disposition:

RP complained numerous calls for service were not handled appropriately.

Service Complaints

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Jul 5, 2023
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Constitutional Rights
Disposition:

RP complained communication specialists gave him/her incorrect information and failed to provide proper assistance.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Jul 5, 2023
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Disputed Facts
Disposition: Dismissed-Other

RP complained he/she was unjustly detained.
Dismiss - no policy violations.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Jul 5, 2023
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP complained a detective mishandled an investigation.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Jul 11, 2023
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Service level
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP complained a detective failed to contact him/her in a timely manner.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Jul 26, 2023
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Service level
Disposition:

RP complained his/her request for service was mishandled.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Jul 27, 2023
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Disputed Facts
Disposition:

RP complained an officer improperly applied the law.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Jul 28, 2023
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Courtesy
Disposition: Dismissed-Other

RP complained officers treated him/her improperly.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Jul 28, 2023
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Service level
Disposition:

RP complained officers improperly handled a call for service.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Jul 31, 2023
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Disputed Facts
Disposition: Dismissed-alt remedy

RP complained a traffic stop was improper.
Dismiss - alternate remedy.

Policy Complaints

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Jul 17, 2023

Class/sub-class: Policy Complaint
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP complained an officer acted improperly during a traffic stop.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Jul 24, 2023
Class/sub-class: Policy Complaint
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP complained an officer used his/her law enforcement authority to drive improperly.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Jul 27, 2023
Class/sub-class: Policy Complaint
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP complained an officer failed to appropriately investigate a traffic collision.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Jul 27, 2023
Class/sub-class: Policy Complaint
Disposition:

RP questioned the utilization of a police K9 on private property.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Jul 28, 2023
Class/sub-class: Policy Complaint
Disposition: Dismissed-previously reviewed

RP complained members of Eugene PD improperly deployed their body worn cameras.

Incident Reviews

Incident type: Incident Review
Status: Completed
Received date: Jul 14, 2023
Class/sub-class: Incident Review / Conduct
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP complained officers engaged in improper conduct.

Incident type: Incident Review
Status: Completed
Received date: Jul 21, 2023
Class/sub-class: Incident Review / Use of Force
Disposition: Administratively Closed

RP alleged an officer acted improperly.
Dismiss - insufficient information to investigate.

Incident type: Incident Review
Status: Active
Received date: Jul 25, 2023
Class/sub-class: Incident Review / Performance
Disposition:

RP complained an officer improperly handled a traffic stop and was insensitive to the civilian's health.

Incident type: Incident Review
Status: Active
Received date: Jul 26, 2023
Class/sub-class: Incident Review / Conduct
Disposition:

RP alleged officers violated constitutional rights in an investigation.

Incident type: Incident Review
Status: Active
Received date: Jul 31, 2023
Class/sub-class: Incident Review / Use of Force
Disposition:

RP alleged an officer used force in excess of what was reasonable.

Incident type: Incident Review
Status: Active
Received date: Jul 31, 2023
Class/sub-class: Incident Review / Performance
Disposition:

RP alleged an employee's conduct was substandard.

Allegations of Misconduct

Incident type: IA Investigation
Status: Active
Received date: Jul 18, 2023
Class/sub-class: Allegation of Misconduct / Conduct
Disposition:

1. 103.4.1 Judgment: That Communications Specialist A failed to use his/her training, experience, and observation to appropriately respond to a caller on July 17, 2023.
2. 103.5.9 Conduct: That Communications Specialist A engaged in conduct that brought the department into disrepute when he/she called a caller an "idiot" on July 17, 2023.
3. 103.5.8 Courtesy: That Communications Specialist A failed to use tact in his/her interactions, control his/her temper, or exercise patience and discretion when he/she shouted over a distressed caller on July 17, 2023.

Incident type: IA Investigation
Status: Active
Received date: Jul 27, 2023
Class/sub-class: Allegation of Misconduct / Performance
Disposition:

As to Officer A:

1. 1203.7.1.c Body Worn Video: that on June 18, 2023, Officer A failed to use his/her BWV system while he/she conducted an investigative encounter.

As to Sergeant B:

1. 1203.7.1.c Body Worn Video: that on June 18, 2023, Sgt. B failed to use his/her BWV system while he/she conducted an investigative encounter.

Eugene Police Department

July 2023 Closed Case Report

Incident type: IA Investigation
Status: Completed
Received date: Oct 31, 2022
Class/sub-class: Allegation of Misconduct / Constitutional Rights
Disposition: Sustained

Allegations:

1. 103.5.5.2 Retaliation in the Community: that Sergeant A engaged in retaliatory behavior when he/she directed officers to arrest all residents of a house after certain residents asserted their constitutional right to refuse entry, and when several residents had already received citations in lieu of custody.
2. 322 Search and Seizure: that Sergeant A prevented the residents from denying him/her entry to their residence, without a warrant or a valid exception to the warrant requirement, by preventing them from closing their front door.
3. 103.4.1 Judgment - Sergeant A did not demonstrate good judgment in his/her handling of the situation, including his/her failure to consider questions from multiple officers regarding his/her decision to jail compliant residents.
4. 103.5.8.d Courtesy: that Sergeant A failed to "use tact in their interactions, control their temper, exercise patience and discretion, and not allow themselves to be provoked by the actions of others" when he/she threatened that exercise of constitutional rights (such as right to a trial) would result in negative consequences.

Incident type: IA Investigation
Status: Completed
Received date: Jan 11, 2023
Class/sub-class: Allegation of Misconduct / Constitutional Rights
Disposition: Sustained

Allegations for Officer A:

1. 322.2 Search and Seizure: that Officer A entered the Involved Citizen's residence in Eugene, Oregon, without a search warrant or valid exception to the warrant requirement.
2. 1203.7.1 Body-Worn Video: that Officer A failed to use his/her BWV system while he/she conducted an investigative encounter with Involved Citizen.

Allegation for Officer B:

1. 322.2 Search and Seizure: that Officer B entered the Involved Citizen's residence in Eugene, Oregon, without a search warrant or valid exception to the warrant requirement.

Incident type: IA Investigation
Status: Completed
Received date: Jan 27, 2023
Class/sub-class: Allegation of Misconduct / Conduct
Disposition: Sustained

Allegations:

1. 103.5.4 Adherence to Laws and Department Policy: that Officer A did not comply with all laws and statutes, city, state and federal, when he/she allegedly drove to a SWAT callout while under the influence of intoxicants.
2. 103.5.18.a Intoxicants: Alcohol and Controlled Substances: that Officer A reported for a SWAT callout following the use of intoxicants, where such use impaired his/her ability to perform assigned duties.
3. 103.5.18.e Intoxicants: Alcohol and Controlled Substances: that Officer A failed to notify a supervisor when he/she was subject to a call-back and had recently used intoxicants.
4. 103.5.14 Unsatisfactory Performance: that Officer A failed to perform the required tasks associated with his/her official duties as a SWAT officer during a callout.

Incident type: IA Investigation
Status: Completed
Received date: Mar 3, 2023
Class/sub-class: Allegation of Misconduct / Use of Force
Disposition: Within Policy

Allegation:

1. 800 Use of Force: That Officer A used force in a manner inconsistent with EPD training during his/her arrest of the Involved Citizen.

Incident type: IA Investigation
Status: Completed
Received date: Jun 29, 2023
Class/sub-class: Allegation of Criminal Conduct / Conduct
Disposition: Dismissed-previously reviewed

Captain A from a correctional facility contacted the OPA and reported than an inmate made allegations of sexual assault by a Eugene PD officer.

Dismiss/Previously Reviewed.

Office of the Police Auditor
August 2023 Open Case Report

Inquiries

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Aug 1, 2023
Class/sub-class: Inquiry
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP complained officers mishandled an interaction with a civilian.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Aug 4, 2023
Class/sub-class: Inquiry
Disposition:

RP complained officers improperly handled an investigation.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Aug 4, 2023
Class/sub-class: Inquiry
Disposition: Dismissed-Other

RP complained two communications specialists were insensitive.
Dismiss - no policy violations occurred.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Aug 4, 2023
Class/sub-class: Inquiry
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP complained officers failed to properly respond to an urgent call for service.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Aug 8, 2023
Class/sub-class: Inquiry
Disposition: Dismissed-o/s jurisdiction

RP complained officers wrongly towed his/her vehicle.
Dismiss - outside jurisdiction/agency.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Aug 11, 2023
Class/sub-class: Inquiry
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP complained officers failed to conduct a complete investigation.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Aug 14, 2023
Class/sub-class: Inquiry

Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP complained officers failed to perform a thorough investigation and failed to follow up with him/her.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Aug 16, 2023
Class/sub-class: Inquiry
Disposition:

RP complained officers used unnecessary force during his/her arrest and lost his/her cellphone during processing.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Aug 21, 2023
Class/sub-class: Inquiry
Disposition:

RP complained an officer mishandled an investigation and wrongly cited him/her.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Aug 21, 2023
Class/sub-class: Inquiry
Disposition:

RP complained an officer improperly operated a drone and violated his/her constitutional rights.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Aug 23, 2023
Class/sub-class: Inquiry
Disposition: Dismissed-o/s jurisdiction

RP complained a civilian violated his/her rights.
Dismiss - not a Eugene PD employee.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Aug 24, 2023
Class/sub-class: Inquiry
Disposition:

RP complained a communications specialist provided substandard service.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Aug 25, 2023
Class/sub-class: Inquiry
Disposition:

RP complained a communication specialist failed to provide proper assistance, and a call for service was improperly handled.

Incident type: Auditor Intake
Status: Initial
Received date: Aug 27, 2023
Class/sub-class: Inquiry
Disposition: Dismiss - other

RP complained investigators failed to make an arrest in an investigation.

Dismiss - no allegation of misconduct/violation of policy.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Aug 31, 2023
Class/sub-class: Inquiry
Disposition:

RP complained a third party was not prosecuted.

Service Complaints

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Aug 7, 2023
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Service level
Disposition: Resolved

RP complained an officer failed to follow up with him/her regarding an investigation.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Aug 9, 2023
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Service level
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP complained officers failed to respond promptly to a call for service.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Aug 10, 2023
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Service level
Disposition:

RP complained a request for service went unanswered, and an officer failed to follow-up with him/her.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Aug 11, 2023
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance
Disposition: Supervisor Review-Closed

RP complained an officer improperly handled an incident.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Aug 11, 2023
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance
Disposition:

RP complained an officer failed to perform his/her duties.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Aug 15, 2023
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance
Disposition:

RP complained an officer improperly handled an investigation.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Aug 16, 2023
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Service level
Disposition:

RP complained officer failed to follow up with his/her request for assistance.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Aug 24, 2023
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Performance
Disposition:

RP complained an officer improperly handled an investigation and failed to communicate with him/her.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Aug 29, 2023
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Service level
Disposition: Dismissed-o/s jurisdiction

RP complained parking violations were not enforced.
Dismiss - outside jurisdiction/agency.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Aug 30, 2023
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Service level
Disposition:

RP complained an officer improperly handled an investigation.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Completed
Received date: Aug 30, 2023
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Use of Force
Disposition: Dismissed-Other

RP complained officers used unnecessary force during his/her recent arrests.
Dismiss - no policy violations occurred.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Aug 30, 2023
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Service level
Disposition:

RP complained an investigation was improperly handled.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Aug 31, 2023
Class/sub-class: Service Complaint / Service level
Disposition:

RP complained a criminal was not prosecuted and the officer failed to follow-up with him/her.

Policy Complaints

Incident type: Supervisor Action

Status: Active
Received date: Aug 9, 2023
Class/sub-class: Policy Complaint
Disposition:

RP requested a modification to the handcuffing policy.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Aug 22, 2023
Class/sub-class: Policy Complaint
Disposition:

RP complained a communications specialist was unprofessional regarding a noise complaint assistance request.

Incident type: Supervisor Action
Status: Active
Received date: Aug 28, 2023
Class/sub-class: Policy Complaint
Disposition:

RP complained an officer gave improper information regarding a traffic citation.

Incident Reviews

Incident type: Incident Review
Status: Active
Received date: Aug 7, 2023
Class/sub-class: Incident Review / Discrimination
Disposition:

RP complained officers encouraged racially motivated detainment of an individual.

Incident type: Incident Review
Status: Active
Received date: Aug 8, 2023
Class/sub-class: Incident Review / Performance
Disposition:

RP complained he/she was erroneously arrested.

Incident type: Incident Review
Status: Active
Received date: Aug 14, 2023
Class/sub-class: Incident Review / Performance
Disposition:

RP alleged his/her firearms (stored for safekeeping) were mishandled by officers.

Incident type: Incident Review
Status: Active
Received date: Aug 17, 2023
Class/sub-class: Incident Review
Disposition:

RP alleged officers improperly contacted him/her to follow up on an investigation.

Police Commendations

The Eugene Police Department Commendations from citizens for August 2023 maybe found at the link below.

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