

Police Policy Committee Minutes

May 22, 2025

The Police Policy Committee of the Board on Public Safety Standards and Training held a regular meeting on May 22, 2025, at the Oregon Public Safety Academy in Salem, Oregon. Chair, Scotty Nowning called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

Committee Members:

Scotty Nowning, Chair, Non-Management Law Enforcement
Casey Coddling, Vice Chair, Superintendent, Oregon State Police
DaNeshia Barret, Non-Management Law Enforcement
Angela Brandenburg, Oregon State Sheriff's Association
Mark Daniel, Oregon Association of Chiefs of Police
Christopher Gjovik, Portland Police Bureau (Designee for Chief Bob Day) (Teams)
Kevin Dresser, Non-Management Law Enforcement
Michelle Duncan, Oregon State Sheriff's Association
Teresa Livingston, OSP Command Staff Representative
Megan Townsend, Non-Management Law Enforcement
Doug Olsen, SAC, Federal Bureau of Investigation
Patricia Lofgren, Public Member
Rob Wood, Public Member

Committee Members Absent:

Anel Ceric, Non-Management Law Enforcement
Terry Rowan, Oregon State Sheriff's Association

Guests:

Kent van der Kamp
Almedia Javor
KGW News Reporter Celine Stevens
KGW News Photographer Richard Gordon

DPSST Staff:

Phil Castle, Director
Kathy McAlpine, Deputy Director
Kathy Fink, Standards and Certification Program Manager
Marie Atwood, DPSST Legal Counsel
Melissa Lang-Bacho, Professional Standards Compliance Coordinator
Jennifer Levario Professional Standards Compliance Coordinator
Cindy Park, Professional Standards Compliance Coordinator
Jennifer Howald, Administrative Rules Coordinator
Sam Tenney, Public Information Officer
Erica Riddell, Criminal Justice Support Specialist
Juan Lopez-Hernandez, Executive Support Specialist
Brie Murphy, Academy Operations Manager
Gerod Rayburn, Skills Training Manager

Audra Anderson, HR Manager



1. Introductions

Introductions of members, guests and staff.

2. Approve February 20, 2025 Meeting Minutes

A consensus was reached to approve the February 20, 2025, meeting minutes as written.

3. Administrative Closure Consent Agenda

Presented by Melissa Lang-Bacho, Professional Standards Compliance Coordinator

The Department presented recommendations to administratively close the following professional standards cases to the Police Policy Committee.

a) Baldwin, Gregory (23593) Police

On July 31, 2020, Gregory Baldwin resigned from the Portland Police Bureau (PPB). At the time of his resignation, Baldwin was the subject of two internal investigations into his completion of reports in a timely manner, response to a records request, and his failure to report his work-issued phone as lost within the timeframes of the agency's policies. Baldwin had initially retired from the PPB in 2016 but returned a few months later as part of the PPB's retire-to-rehire program.

In August of 2019, Baldwin assisted another officer in an investigation that resulted in the arrest of a subject for possession of a firearm by a convicted felon. Baldwin failed to write a report in a timely manner, despite multiple requests to do so. Baldwin ultimately submitted a report on November 22, 2019. Baldwin's report was necessary to establish probable cause and delayed the prosecution in the case.

In September 2019, Baldwin was dispatched to a report of a stolen handgun and identity theft. Baldwin drafted a report but did not complete the report because he was waiting for the victim to locate the serial number of the firearm. The records division sent requests for Baldwin to complete his report by October 14, 2019, and a second request on November 9, 2019. A third request was sent, copying his commander was sent on March 12, 2020. Baldwin ultimately submitted the report.

Multiple other reports follow the same pattern of requiring multiple prompts for Baldwin to complete reports.

Based on the information provided, the Department did not find sufficient information related to Baldwin's separation that would indicate he violated the Board's moral fitness standards defined in Oregon Administrative Rule. Baldwin's conduct and actions were ultimately performance-based issues. Though there were inefficiencies created in the delayed completion of Baldwin's reports, there does not appear to be additional misconduct associated with the delays that would imply these inefficiencies were moral fitness violations.

b) Brightbill, Todd (30976) Police

The Department opened a professional standards case to review the circumstances of Todd Brightbill's November 1, 2020, settlement agreement with the Multnomah County Sheriff's Office (MCSO) following an investigation into allegations Brightbill failed to

follow directives in a Letter of Expectation (LOE).

The MCSO began an investigation related to allegations that Brightbill had failed to follow the directives laid out in a Letter of Expectation (LOE) issued on March 21, 2019. At the conclusion of the MCSO's investigation, the recommended disciplinary action was 40 hours of unpaid suspension, demotion, and a fitness for duty examination. Brightbill and the MCSO signed a settlement agreement that separated Brightbill from employment with the county. In the settlement agreement, the MCSO agreed to not impose the demotion and withdrew the requirement Brightbill receive a fitness for duty evaluation.

The agreement kept Brightbill on paid administrative leave until the date of his retirement, except for the duration of his unpaid 40-hour suspension. Based on the information provided, the Department has determined Brightbill's separation was primarily performance-based conduct and there was insufficient information to find moral fitness violations defined in Oregon Administrative Rule.

The MCSO's investigation reflects that Brightbill was not facing termination for his conduct. Brightbill's use of force actions may have been concerning but they were not identified as being excessive or outside of policy with the MCSO. Though Brightbill's actions were not appropriate they did not rise to the level of a moral fitness issue.

c) Bryson, Brian (33308) Police

On June 1, 2024, Brian Bryson retired from the Klamath County Sheriff's Office (KCSO). On August 23, 2024, the KCSO provided the Department with a personnel action separation form (F4s) which indicates that Bryson's separation came during an investigation into allegations of misconduct. The form also notes there were uninvestigated allegations at the time of separation. The form reflects that at the time of separation, Bryson was the Operations Captain for the KCSO. Based on the circumstances documented on the F4s, the Department opened a professional standards case to review the separation for moral fitness violations.

The Department requested a copy of investigative materials from the KCSO related to Bryson's separation. The Department was provided with a letter outlining the events that proceeded Bryson's separation, a copy of a notice that placed Bryson on administrative leave on March 25, 2024, Bryson's retirement letter, and a highlighted section of a policy. The letter indicates that no investigation occurred, and no investigative documents or files exist.

On February 21, 2025, the Department received an amended F4s form from the KCSO. The form was sent with the message "Due to legal ramifications a new F4s is being sent for Brian Bryson that supersedes the F4s form sent to DPSST in August of 2024..." The amended F4s, no longer reflects that Bryson was under investigation at the time of his separation and indicates no uninvestigated allegations were pending.

Based on the information provided, the Department determined Bryson's separation was not concurrent to allegations of misconduct and did not reflect a moral fitness issue requiring review by the Department.

d) Dickson, Dexter (30571) Police

On August 17, 2021, Dexter Dickson was terminated from the Redmond Police Department after they sustained allegations of misconduct and policy violations during an internal investigation. On April 4, 2023, Dickson passed away.

e) Garland, Garrick (32091) Police

On June 12, 2019, Garrick Garland was terminated from the Washington County Sheriff's Office (WCSO) after an internal investigation sustained findings that he violated agency policies for Truthfulness, Professional Conduct, Knowledge and Enforcement of Policies and Orders, and Withholding of Criminal Information.

After Garland was terminated, he filed a grievance, and his termination was taken to arbitration. The arbitrator found there was not clear and convincing evidence to show that Garland had been untruthful and he had not damaged the relationship between the agencies. The arbitrator did find that he failed to write a timely report and did not log the property into evidence. On April 9, 2020, the arbitrator ordered that Garland be returned to employment.

The Department reviewed his termination and the arbitration order on August 20, 2020, and closed the professional standards case related to his separation at that time.

On August 18, 2020, the Department was notified that Garland was separated from the WCSO and a new professional standards case was opened to review the circumstances of his separation.

On May 7, 2020, Garland was designated by the Washington County District Attorney as an "Alert" witness based on the information provided to them from his arbitration and termination. After being designated as an "Alert" witness and being prohibited from testifying in the county, the WCSO notified Garland that because he was no longer able to perform the duties of his position as a Deputy, he was being laid off and would be placed on the recall list. The notice that was provided to Garland indicates that it is a non-disciplinary action.

Based on the information provided, the Department has determined Garland's separation did not involve a new moral fitness violation for the Department to review. The Department previously reviewed his professional standards case related to his initial separation and arbitration and found there were no moral fitness violations. His layoff from the WCSO is based upon the determination from the DA's review of the arbitrator's opinion and his earlier termination. The department did not find there were additional moral fitness violations to review in this case.

f) Kashuba, Dina (58371) Police

On March 15, 2022, Dina Kashuba resigned from the Portland Police Bureau (PPB). At the time of her resignation, there was an open investigation reviewing allegations of misconduct.

On February 21, 2021, multiple PPB officers arrested a subject. In December 2021, the subject of the arrest filed a liability claim against PPB which stated Kashuba broke her arm, threw her to the ground, and failed to provide medical care.

On April 13, 2022, the PPB completed its investigation into the allegations. The investigation determined the allegation that Kashuba broke the subject's arm was unfounded. The

allegations Kashuba threw the woman to the ground and failed to provide her with medical care were not sustained.

Based on the information provided, the Department has determined Kashuba's separation did not violate the Board's moral fitness standards defined in Oregon Administrative Rule.

g) Ramsdell, Hannah (58371) Police

On February 19, 2024, Hannah Ramsdell resigned from the Lake Oswego Police Department (LOPD) while under investigation for dishonesty during her background investigation. This investigation was opened due to the LOPD being provided with information from the Portland Police Bureau (PPB) that suggested Ramsdell may have been dishonest during her LOPD background investigation. The PPB came across the information when Ramsdell applied for a job with PPB as a lateral recruit.

The allegations against Ramsdell were as follows:

- Failure to disclose or misrepresent material facts or make any false or misleading statement on any application...
- Falsification of any work-related records...
- Failure to participate in, or give false or misleading statements, or misrepresenting or omitting material information to a supervisor or other person in a position of authority...
- Being untruthful or knowingly making false, misleading, or malicious statements...

All allegations were NOT SUSTAINED by the LOPD due to lack of evidence, corroboration, and Ramsdell's resignation prior to being interviewed.

The Department determined Ramsdell's conduct may violate the Board's moral fitness standards as defined in the Oregon Administrative Rule. However, evidence related to the conduct lacked corroboration and Ramsdell resigned before being interviewed leaving unanswered questions that may have provided additional information. Therefore, the Department could not provide substantial evidence to support a moral fitness violation.

h) Seymour, Larry (41243) Police

On January 19, 2024, Larry Seymour resigned from the Prineville Police Department (PPD) according to a settlement agreement between the City of Prineville and Seymour. The City of Prineville reported on the F4s Personnel Action—Separation form that it conducted three investigations regarding Seymour's leadership. The City of Prineville ultimately determined that Seymour had lost his ability to lead the department effectively and that his reintegration into the department would be detrimental to all parties.

The investigations began when an Administrative Services Manager (ASM) for the City of Prineville reported to Human Resources (HR) and the City Manager that she believed a police recruit in training was being treated unfairly by Chief Seymour and a PPD Captain because of her work injury and/or light duty. Additionally, the ASM believed she (the ASM) was being bullied, harassed, and/or retaliated against for reporting the allegations.

The Department determined Seymour's conduct concurrent to his separation may violate the Board's moral fitness standards as defined in Oregon Administrative Rule. However, the evidence provided to the Department offers conflicting investigative findings that provoke

more questions. Additionally, there is a lack of corroborating evidence to support findings of intentional dishonesty, intentional misuse of authority, or misconduct. The Department's review determined that much of the evidence provided included individual perception and was lacking independent witnesses.

The Department's review scope does not allow for further in-depth investigation beyond what has been provided, therefore the preponderance of evidence threshold needed to make a moral fitness violation finding has not been met.

DaNeshia Barrett moved to approve the Administrative Closure Consent Agenda recommendations made by the Department. Mark Daniel seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Clark, Randy (23388) Certification Review: Police

Presented by Melissa Lang-Bacho, Professional Standards Compliance Coordinator

Reason for Discretionary Review

On June 15, 2022, Randy Clark retired from the Central Point Police Department (CPPD) during an investigation into allegations that he was continuing to contact his former girlfriend after repeated requests to cease contact.

<i>Police Policy Committee Discussion/Consensus/Vote</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Vote</i>	<i>Outcome</i>
A consensus was reached to adopt the record.			
<p>The Police Policy Committee found the following moral fitness violations and factors:</p> <p><i>Moral Fitness Violations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dishonesty: The committee did not identify elements of dishonesty. • Misuse of Authority: The committee did not identify elements of misuse of authority. • Misconduct: Clark harmed the efficient operations of the CPPD by negatively impacting the morale and good order at the agency by telling co-workers, while he was on administrative leave, that he was being treated unfairly. Clark harmed another person by making repeated attempts to contact his former girlfriend, who wished not to communicate with him. Clark's appearance at his former girlfriend's place of employment harmed the efficient operations of her place of employment and made her co-workers feel uncomfortable. <p><i>Aggravating Factors:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clark's former girlfriend purchased a home and vehicle without him knowing. • There is sufficient information to find that Clark's behaviors met the criteria for stalking. • Clark had 30 years of experience in law enforcement and knows what stalking is. 			

- Clark could not accept that his behavior was over the line and eluded he did not know if his conduct could be considered stalking.
- Clark's personal matter was messy, and his agency could get involved. Clark's agency had the right to restrict his actions.
- Clark walked into a meeting and asked if he was being fired.
- Clark told his girlfriend not to tell anyone what he was doing because he knew he would get in trouble, and that his conduct was wrong.

Mitigating Factors:

- There are details lacking in the totality of the investigation, which contains inferences but sometimes little details.
- Clark's former girlfriend identified that they had broken up multiple times, and she was not concerned for her safety.
- The court system is set up to address circumstances like this with stalking or restraining orders, however, the former girlfriend chose not to use that route and involved Clark's employer.
- It was questioned if the CPPD had the authority to interfere in Clark's personal life and base an investigation on a personal issue.
- It is common for officers to use their work phone to contact family members. In this situation, there was not enough information about the situation to determine if this was a misuse of the agency's equipment.
- The former girlfriend indicated that she just wanted the contact to stop, and she did not want Clark to lose his job.
- If the mindset from the CPPD was that Clark's conduct was criminal, it should have been referred immediately for a criminal investigation.
- There was not enough information to say that Clark was contacting his former girlfriend on his work phone because she did not know the number, and she had his personal number blocked.

A consensus was reached to confirm the identified aggravating and mitigating factors.

Scotty Nowning moved that the Police Policy Committee modify the moral fitness violations as presented to remove dishonesty and misuse of authority but affirm misconduct.	Angela Brandenburg	11 ayes; 0 nays	Motion Passed Unanimously
DaNeshia Barrett moved, after considering the identified violations of the Board's moral fitness standards and weighing the aggravating and mitigating circumstances unique to this case,	Teresa Livingston	11 ayes; 0 nays	Motion Passed Unanimously

that Board action should be taken against Clark's certifications.			
DaNeshia Barrett moved, after considering the totality of the case, that Clark be ineligible to hold public safety certification for 3 years.	Patricia Lofgren	11 ayes; 0 nays	Motion Passed Unanimously

5. Javor, Almedina (61328) Certification Review: Police

Presented by Melissa Lang-Bacho, Professional Standards Compliance Coordinator

Reason for Discretionary Review

On February 22, 2023, Almedina Javor resigned from the Columbia River Inter-Tribal Police Department (CRITPD) during an internal investigation into her violation of the department's relationship policy.

Almedina Javor provided verbal mitigation for committee consideration.

<i>Police Policy Committee Discussion/Consensus/Vote</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Vote</i>	<i>Outcome</i>
A consensus was reached to adopt the record.			
<p>The Police Policy Committee found the following moral fitness violations and factors:</p> <p><i>Moral Fitness Violations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dishonesty: The committee did not identify sufficient information to make a finding of dishonesty. • Misuse of Authority: Javor ran the license plate of the vehicle owned by her romantic partner after she was questioned about her relationship with him. Javor misused her position to intentionally retrieve information from the Law Enforcement Data System (LEDS) for her benefit. • Misconduct: Javor's romantic relationship with Associate 1, a known felony offender, threatened or harmed the efficient operations of the CRTIPD: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Javor's romantic relationship damaged the standing and trust within the community. • Javor utilized agency time set aside for her to conduct patrols to foster a romantic relationship. • Javor's neglect of her duties to foster a relationship impacted the morale of the officers who were performing their duties efficiently. • Javor's misuse of the Law Enforcement Data Systems (LEDS) to look up information on Associate 1 threatened the agency's access to the system, which could diminish the day-to-day operations of the agency were they to be sanctioned for her actions. <p><i>Aggravating Factors:</i></p>			

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Javor's relationship was reported to the agency by a member of the community and may not have come to light if that did not occur. The CRITPD gave Javor the option to end the relationship and continue her employment, or continue the relationship and end her employment, and Javor chose to continue the relationship. The record establishes that Javor ran the license plate of the vehicle registered to her home address after she began the relationship and was confronted by her agency. Javor stated in her verbal mitigation that she did not know it was against policy to have a relationship with a known felon. Javor attended the OPSA, participated in FTEP, officer safety courses, and signed acknowledging her agency's relationship policy. Each of these would have covered that her relationship with the known felon was required to be disclosed to her agency. Affiliating with felons should be something that a person working as a police officer questions. <p><i>Mitigating Factors:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was no pattern of her use of law enforcement data systems for her benefit. 			
A consensus was reached to confirm the identified aggravating and mitigating factors.			
Casey Coddling moved that the Police Policy Committee affirm the moral fitness violations as presented.	DaNeshia Barrett	11 ayes; 0 nays	Motion Passed Unanimously
Megan Townsend moved, after considering the identified violations of the Board's moral fitness standards and weighing the aggravating and mitigating circumstances unique to this case, that Board action should be taken against Javor's certifications.	Scotty Nowning	11 ayes; 0 nays	Motion Passed Unanimously
Michelle Duncan moved, after considering the totality of the case, that Javor be ineligible to hold public safety certification for 10 years.	Megan Townsend	11 ayes; 0 nays	Motion Passed Unanimously

6. Kienlen, Jeffrey (30358) Certification Review: Police

Presented by Melissa Lang-Bacho, Professional Standards Compliance Coordinator

Reason for Discretionary Review

On March 5, 2021, Jeffrey Kienlen was terminated from The Dalles Police Department (TDPD) after he was placed on the Wasco County District Attorney's (WCDA) Tier 1 Brady List and barred from testifying in any case prosecuted by the WCDA's office. Kienlen was placed on the Brady list for conduct that occurred in 2011, which previously had not been reviewed by the WCDA's office.

<i>Police Policy Committee Discussion/Consensus/Vote</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Vote</i>	<i>Outcome</i>
A consensus was reached to adopt the record.			
<p>The Police Policy Committee found the following moral fitness violations and factors:</p> <p><i>Moral Fitness Violations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dishonesty: Kienlen was intentionally untruthful in his request to use a city vehicle to travel to his cousin's home while attending training in Eugene. Instead, he traveled to Salem for personal reasons. Kienlen intentionally made false statements to his supervisor and a fellow officer regarding his whereabouts during the training. • Misuse of Authority: The committee did not identify elements of misuse of authority. • Misconduct: Kienlen's conduct resulted in a highly publicized review which reflects poorly on the law enforcement profession and the recommendation to dismiss 106 criminal court cases including the dismissal of 37 felony cases, creating a potential risk and negative impact to the victims and the community, and as such, created an inefficient operation of TDPD and the WCDA's office. <p><i>Aggravating Factors:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kienlen's reason for being untruthful was foolish and very unnecessary. • The level of impact on criminal cases in the county was aggravating. • Kienlen was manipulative and premeditated his plan. • The degree of Kienlen's dishonesty and misuse of resources is not someone that would be reliable or wanted in the profession. • The impact of Kienlen's conduct on the District Attorney's office was aggravating. • The impact of the cases expunged was aggravating. <p><i>Mitigating Factors:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The committee did not identify any mitigating factors. 			
A consensus was reached to confirm the identified aggravating and mitigating factors.			

Mark Daniel moved that the Police Policy Committee affirm the moral fitness violations as presented.	Casey Coddling	11 ayes; 0 nays	Motion Passed Unanimously
Scotty Nowning moved, after considering the identified violations of the Board's moral fitness standards and weighing the aggravating and mitigating circumstances unique to this case, that Board action should be taken against Lynn's certifications.	Michelle Duncan	11 ayes; 0 nays	Motion Passed Unanimously
Michelle Duncan moved, after considering the totality of the case, that Kienlen be ineligible to hold public safety certification for a lifetime.	Patricia Lofgren	11 ayes; 0 nays	Motion Passed Unanimously

7. Lynn, Alan (31664) Certification Review: Police

Presented by Melissa Lang-Bacho, Professional Standards Compliance Coordinator

Reason for Discretionary Review

On March 31, 2021, Alan Lynn retired from the Albany Police Department (APD) while under investigation for allegations of dishonesty and neglect of duty related to his submission of a supplemental police report. At the time of his retirement, Lynn was a Captain.

<i>Police Policy Committee Discussion/Consensus/Vote</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Vote</i>	<i>Outcome</i>
Michelle Duncan disclosed a potential or perceived conflict of interest in this case due to previously working with the individual. Duncan declared she would be able to remain unbiased because she feels she can make a fair determination based on the information presented.			
A consensus was reached to adopt the record.			
<p>The Police Policy Committee found the following moral fitness violations and factors:</p> <p><i>Moral Fitness Violations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dishonesty: Lynn's intentional conduct was meant to deceive others into believing he completed a report when he did not. • Misuse of Authority: The committee did not identify elements of misuse of authority. • Misconduct: Lynn's failure to submit a supplemental report for several months created an inefficient operation for the Albany Police Department and damaged the agency's reputation in the community. 			

<p><i>Aggravating Factors:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Once Lynn figured out that he had failed to submit a report, he was dishonest about it. Lynn submitted the report and said that he had submitted it a month previously. <p><i>Mitigating Factors:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lynn provided written mitigation, which reflected that he was diagnosed with a medical condition shortly after his separation, that could have impacted his memory. There was no benefit to him to not submit a report. There was uncertainty in the record if he had already written a report and failed to transfer it or if he wrote it at the time he submitted it. Lynn did not have a history of dishonesty or failing to submit reports. The member of the public was not harmed aside from experiencing a delay in receiving the report. Lynn's medical records provided were mitigating. Lynn believed that he submitted the report and owned his actions once he found out he was wrong. 			
A consensus was reached to confirm the identified aggravating and mitigating factors.			
Rob Wood moved that the Police Policy Committee affirm the moral fitness violations as presented.	Casey Coddling	11 ayes; 0 nays	Motion Passed Unanimously
Teresa Livingston moved, after considering the identified violations of the Board's moral fitness standards and weighing the aggravating and mitigating circumstances unique to this case, that no Board action should be taken against Lynn's certifications.	DaNeshia Barrett	11 ayes; 0 nays	Motion Passed Unanimously

8. van der Kamp, Kent (44640) Certification Review: Police

Presented by Kathy McAlpine and Cindy Park, Professional Standards Compliance Coordinator

Reason for Discretionary Review

On December 6, 2023, a complaint was received by the Department regarding Sergeant Kent van der Kamp of the Deschutes County Sheriff's Office (DCSO). The complaint was determined to be jurisdictional and forwarded to the Sheriff of the DCSO for review. On March 2, 2024, the department received additional information via certified mail from the complainant. The additional information was also forwarded to the Sheriff of the DCSO for

review. In response to the information provided, the DCSO opened an Internal Affairs (IA) investigation.

The Sheriff notified van der Kamp via a memo dated August 15, 2024, that an independent investigator had been appointed to review the information provided in the complaint.

The initial complaint was received prior to van der Kamp's election as the Deschutes County Sheriff on November 5, 2024.

On November 14, 2024, a memo was sent to DCSO Sheriff Nelson from the Deschutes County Legal Counsel, requesting that DCSO "refrain from issuing any disciplinary action/sanction (above a level of reprimand letter) without first securing review and approval from Risk and Legal."

A memo written by the DCSO Undersheriff on December 5, 2024, stated the DCSO closed the IA administratively. The memo indicated that the independent investigation was completed; however, the office did not complete the disciplinary process because van der Kamp, who was now the sheriff-elect, went out on personal leave prior to a Loudermill Hearing occurring.

On December 30, 2024, the Department requested documentation from the completed DCSO independent investigation. A professional standards review was opened to determine if the reported behavior violated board-established employment, training, or certification standards for public safety professionals per Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) 259-008-0300(3)(F).

On April 7, 2025, the Department was notified that the Deschutes County District Attorney's Office (DCDAO) had completed an investigation related to false/misleading statements van der Kamp made while testifying in criminal cases regarding his education. The DCDAO initiated an internal investigation into the allegations. Upon completion of the investigation, the Deschutes County District Attorney determined that van der Kamp could no longer be called as a witness by the DCDAO. The Department requested a copy of the DCDAO investigation and received it on April 9, 2025.

Kent van der Kamp provided verbal mitigation for committee consideration.

<i>Police Policy Committee Discussion/Consensus/Vote</i>	<i>Second</i>	<i>Vote</i>	<i>Outcome</i>
Angela Brandenburg and Michelle Duncan disclosed a potential or perceived conflict of interest in this case due to being a member of the Oregon State Sheriff's Association. Brandenburg and Duncan declared they would be able to remain unbiased because they feel they can make a fair determination based on the information presented.			
A consensus was reached to adopt the record.			
The Police Policy Committee found the following moral fitness violations and factors: <i>Moral Fitness Violations:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Dishonesty:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Van der Kamp was intentionally dishonest when he omitted previous employment or volunteer work as an Explorer Scout/reserve police			

officer with the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) and a reserve police officer with the La Mesa Police Department (LMPD) during his employment background investigation processes in 2004 and 2008 with the Deschutes County Sheriff's Office.

- Van der Kamp was intentionally dishonest when he omitted that he was terminated for cause from his position as a reserve police officer for the La Mesa Police Department.
 - Van der Kamp was intentionally dishonest when he reported on five separate forms submitted to the Department from 2008 to 2017 that he had not been discharged from a public agency.
 - Van der Kamp was intentionally dishonest during his interviews with the independent investigator on May 23, 2024, and September 18, 2024.
 - Van der Kamp gave false or misleading information while under oath regarding his education in three criminal trials: June 12, 2013, October 3, 2013, and November 3, 2015, in Deschutes County, Oregon.
 - Van der Kamp omitted information regarding his previous work as a reserve officer in La Mesa, California, while testifying under oath in criminal trials on June 12, 2013, and November 3, 2015.
- Misuse of Authority: The committee did not identify elements of misuse of authority.
 - Misconduct:
 - Van der Kamp harmed the efficient operations of the Deschutes County Sheriff's Office and the public's trust by intentionally falsifying documents submitted to the Department stating he had not been discharged for cause from a public agency, by providing incorrect information on his DCSO background investigation, impacting the DCSO's ability to interview previous law enforcement agencies regarding van der Kamp's performance and conduct as a reserve officer, and by giving misleading public statements and misleading statements to an independent investigator.
 - Van der Kamp threatened or harmed the efficient operations of the DCDAO and the DCSO when van der Kamp provided false testimony while under oath, that resulted in the DA placing him on the county's Brady list. Given this designation, the DCDAO will be reviewing court cases involving van der Kamp's testimony to determine if any action should be taken to protect the rights of criminal defendants and the justice system. Van der Kamp's dishonesty under oath discredits the law enforcement profession and the standing of the DCSO in the community. This dishonesty and the potential reversal of justice found through court processes threatens the efficient operations of the DCSO due to the negative impact of his dishonesty to the community.
 - *Aggravating Factors:*

- Van der Kamp's conduct included an overwhelming amount of inaccuracies, responses, and statements that clearly fall into the category of moral fitness violations for dishonesty.
- Written mitigation adds to the aggravating nature of this case.
- Where there were inconsistencies or discrepancies, van der Kamp minimized his actions.
- Van der Kamp clearly has extended service time, as a reserve in California, performing law enforcement duties with regular officers and solo work.
- Van der Kamp made a point not to talk about unpaid work as a reserve in California and did not include it in his background investigation, but included DCSO search & rescue experience, which is also unpaid, and classified that as law enforcement experience.
- Van der Kamp's continued assertion that providing a college transcript with a class title is sufficient for a law enforcement agency to research and find out what exactly he was doing.
- There is no valid reason why van der Kamp would not include experience as an unpaid reserve in the background information unless the experience was negative, especially considering the time of the application in the 90s, when law enforcement was a sought-after profession.
- The documentation from the LMPD that van der Kamp was a very active reserve officer is significant experience that one would want to include in an application process; however, van der Kamp did not do so.
- Continued denial by van der Kamp, even after documentation was received from LMPD and LAPD to show that the information regarding his work as an Explorer Scout/reserve officer was accurate.
- When van der Kamp was confronted with documentation from the LMPD and LAPD, van der Kamp did not provide a solid no or denial, but simply replied I do not recall.
- Van der Kamp blamed the written information on his Curriculum Vitae (CV) on a third party, which is difficult to believe. Proofreading a CV is a reasonable expectation.
- The CV van der Kamp submitted showed college degrees from universities he did not attend. Van der Kamp then testified to that information, which is beyond logic.
- Van der Kamp provided multiple CVs that change information multiple times throughout the years.
- Although it is possible to make a mistake on a CV, it is hard to understand how van der Kamp testified under oath to an educational background that he did not obtain.
- The Deschutes County District Attorney's report and subsequent Brady designation are aggravating.
- Van der Kamp stated he did not put previous law enforcement experience on his application/background investigation because it was college credits that he was paying for, and he did not consider it employment. However, he had no problem

<p>sharing that previous experience with his Field Training Officer (FTO) because it could be used as a consideration to accelerate his Field Training program.</p> <p><i>Mitigating Factors:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The committee did not identify any mitigating factors 			
<p>A consensus was reached to confirm the identified aggravating and mitigating factors.</p>			
Kevin Dresser moved that the Police Policy Committee affirm the moral fitness violations as presented.	Teresa Livingston	12 ayes; 0 nays	Motion Passed Unanimously
Rob Wood moved, after considering the identified violations of the Board's moral fitness standards and weighing the aggravating and mitigating circumstances unique to this case, that Board action should be taken against Van der Kamp's certifications.	Casey Coddling	12 ayes; 0 nays	Motion Passed Unanimously
Teresa Livingston moved, after considering the totality of the case, that Van der Kamp be ineligible to hold public safety certification for a lifetime.	DaNeshia Barrett	12 ayes; 0 nays	Motion Passed Unanimously

9. Applicant Review Committee Nominations

Presented by Kathy McAlpine, Deputy Director

Scotty Nowning moved to nominate Rob Wood as the new member of the Applicant Review Committee. Angela Brandenburg seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

10. Agency Updates

Presented by Phil Castle, Director

- Director Phil Castle took a moment to thank the Police Policy Committee members and DPSST staff for their continued effort and dedication to the Committee.
- Marie Atwood has been chosen as the new Professional Standards Division Director. She will take the role on July 1st and DPSST is excited to have her on board!
- Director Phil Castle and the Police Policy Committee took an opportunity to recognize committee member DaNeshia Barrett for her service and dedication to the PPC as her terms have now come to an end. We wish her all the luck in her next endeavors.

- The Legislative session is currently in full swing and DPSST is closely monitoring the various House Bills that are on the docket and, if approved, will affect different areas of operation within the department.
- Unfortunately, due to budget constraints in the current legislative session, two of the three POP's (Policy Option Packets) that DPSST had asked for have been tabled. We are still hopeful that we can move forward with the third POP which would be a Learning Management System for the academy. We will know more once the end of the session is closer.
- The DPSST Youth Academy is still in production and will be hosted at DPSST on June 30th. DPSST is expecting about 100 high school aged students to attend. The goal of the Youth Academy is to engage a younger audience and get them interested in the law enforcement and fire professions that are started here at DPSST.

11. Division Updates

Presented by Kathy McAlpine, Deputy Director

- Deputy Director McAlpine also took a moment to express her appreciation for committee members. This session was a heavy lift, and DPSST is thankful for the committees continued commitment to the difficult but important work that we do here.

12. Next Police Policy Committee Meeting: August 21, 2025 at 10:00 a.m.

Administrative Notes:

These minutes reflect the order of the discussion/voting items as they appear on the official meeting agenda. The actual order in which they were discussed may vary.

All documents reviewed and discussed in this meeting are subject to Oregon Public Records Law (ORS 192.410 to ORS 192.505). These documents can be requested by contacting DPSST at dpsst.records@dpsst.oregon.gov.