The Board on Public Safety Standards and Training (BPSST) has the legislative mandate to establish and enforce minimum standards for all law enforcement officers, fire service professionals, telecommunicators and emergency medical dispatchers in the state. This requirement also defines the procedure for the Department and Board to use when denying or revoking certification of an individual who has fallen below the minimum standards.

The Ethics Bulletin is published to provide insight into the types of misconduct that could result in revocation or denial of certification. The following cases have resulted in consideration of revocation or denial of certifications by DPSST in July, 2015.

The Department continues to ensure that certified public safety officers and those seeking certification who abuse the public's trust will be held accountable for their actions.

July Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases Opened</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>Of the 14 Cases Closed:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cases Closed</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Revoked 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Pending</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>Denied 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinstated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No Action 13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Officer A** resigned during a criminal investigation for Fourth Degree Assault, Harassment and two counts of strangulation. DPSST was contacted by Officer A’s attorney requesting a voluntary relinquishment. Officer A voluntarily relinquished his certifications. Officer A’s misconduct ended his 16-year career.

**Officer A’s Basic, Intermediate and Advanced Police Certifications are Revoked.**

**Officer B** applied for training upon being hired, and DPSST learned that he had been arrested several years before for Criminal Driving While Suspended as a result of a previous DUII charge. The District Attorney’s Office later reduced the charge to a violation, and Officer B pled guilty to and was convicted of that violation. Because his case began as a criminal offense, his conduct required review by the Corrections Policy Committee (CPC) before his application for training could be approved. The CPC determined that Officer B’s conduct involved Misconduct and Gross Misconduct, but mitigating circumstances led them to vote to not deny Officer B’s application for training and certification. The Board affirmed the CPC’s recommendation.

**Officer B’s Application for Training is approved.**

**Officer C** applied for training after being hired, and DPSST learned that he had been convicted several years before for Negligent Driving in Washington. The Oregon equivalent of that offense is DUII and required review by the Corrections Policy Committee (CPC). The CPC determined that Officer C’s conduct involved Misconduct and Gross Misconduct, but
mitigating circumstances led them to vote to not deny Officer C’s application for training. The Board affirmed the CPC’s recommendation.

Officer C’s Application for Training is approved.

Officer D was arrested for DUII, Reckless Driving and Assault IV after he drove away from a bar after an altercation, and then assaulted an individual not associated with the original altercation. Officer D entered into a diversion program on the DUII, the Assault IV charge was reduced to a charge of Harassment and then dismissed, and he was convicted of Reckless Driving after his plea of guilty to that charge. DPSST notified Officer D that his conduct would be reviewed by the Corrections Policy Committee (CPC) and gave him the opportunity to provide mitigating circumstances for the Committee’s consideration, which he did. The CPC determined that Officer D’s conduct involved Misconduct and Gross Misconduct, but that mitigating circumstances outweighed aggravating circumstances and so voted to not revoke Officer D’s certifications. The Board affirmed the CPC’s recommendation.

Officer D’s Basic and Intermediate Corrections Certifications remain in good standing.

Telecommunicator E applied for training after being hired, and DPSST learned he had been convicted in Nevada several years before for Driving Under the Influence – Liquor. This conviction required review by the Telecommunications Policy Committee (TPC) before his application for training could be approved. The TPC determined that Telecommunicator E’s conduct involved Misconduct and Gross Misconduct but did not rise to the level to warrant denial of his application for training and subsequent certification. The Board affirmed the vote of the Committee.

Telecommunicator E’s Application for Training is approved.