

**Department of Public Safety Standards and Training
(DPSST or the Department)
Memo**

Date: July 24, 2025

To: Board on Public Safety Standards and Training

From: Cindy Park, Professional Standards Compliance Coordinator

Subject: **Professional Standards Review/Recommendation**
Kent van der Kamp; DPSST No. 44640

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.

Policy Committee Recommendation

The PPC, in a unanimous vote, recommends that the Board take **ACTION** against Kent van der Kamp's Certifications.

The PPC, in a unanimous vote, further recommends Kent van der Kamp be ineligible to hold public safety certification for a lifetime.

Policy Committee Review

The PPC affirmed the following moral fitness violations and factors in making their recommendation.

Moral Fitness Violations:

- Dishonesty:
 - 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/Department did not identify sufficient information to make a finding 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 sharing that previous experience with his Field Training Officer (FTO) because it could be used as a consideration to accelerate his Field Training program.

Mitigating Factors:

- The committee did not identify any mitigating factors

Information Used in Determination

- Transcript of the verbal mitigation.
- PPC Staff Report, with exhibits.

Action Item

Review the committee recommendation and approve or return the recommendation to the policy committee.

**Department of Public Safety Standards and Training
(DPSST or the Department)
Memo**

Date: May 22, 2025

To: Police Policy Committee

From: Kathy McAlpine/ Cindy Park
Deputy Director/ Professional Standards Compliance Coordinator

Subject: **Staff Report –**
Kent van der Kamp, DPSST No. 44640

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.

The Department determined that the conduct being presented to the committee violates the Board's moral fitness standards. Through the case review process, the committee will affirm, modify, or negate the below-identified moral fitness violations and make a determination on the disposition of this case:

Dishonesty: 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 Department did not identify sufficient information to make a finding 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 by 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.

Material Events and Conduct.

A complaint was initially received by the Department regarding van der Kamp on December 6, 2023. The complaint was reviewed by Department staff, who determined the reported conduct was jurisdictional in that, if proven, could violate statutory and administrative rule requirements for public safety professional certification. The complaint was forwarded to the DCSO for review on December 18, 2023, per OAR 259-008-0400(3). Additional information from the complainant was received on March 2, 2024, and forwarded to the agency on March 28, 2024.

The complaint addressed eight separate concerns. Per a memo from the DCSO Undersheriff dated December 30, 2024, “The first seven (7) points/complaints were looked into by myself, the Oregon State Police, and the Prineville Police Department. These first seven were not substantiated or founded to be illegal or violations of the Deschutes County Sheriff’s Office policy.”

The final allegation questioned whether van der Kamp had previous public safety experience in California and if he disclosed that fact to the DCSO along with any information that he had been the subject of any form of discipline. The DCSO contacted the LMPD, who verified van der Kamp’s previous employment/volunteer work with the LMPD.

On May 6, 2024, the DCSO contracted with an outside investigative agency to investigate two specific allegations: 1) van der Kamp failed to disclose prior law enforcement experience or employment-related information during two background investigations originally conducted as part of his employment with DSCO in 2004 and 2008. 2) In direct connection to allegation 1, van der Kamp failed to disclose prior law enforcement experience or employment related to information provided during an unrelated internal affairs investigation interview dated May 23, 2024 (DCSO file #2024-IA-0002).

The complainant provided information directly to the DCSO that included a series of screenshots from an internet site titled “Giglio-Bradylist.com” (an open-source website in which the public can upload information). The screenshots suggested that van der Kamp had previously been a reserve police officer in California and that he had been discharged.

The complaint also included records from the California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) showing van der Kamp had been employed as a reserve police officer with the LMPD from February 24, 1995, to January 28, 1997, and indicated he was discharged from that position.

In April 2024, the Deschutes County Sheriff and Undersheriff began a preliminary investigation into the complaint. The DCSO contacted an LMPD captain and sent a request for records to the agency. The LMPD captain verbally confirmed that van der Kamp had been a reserve officer with the agency. Responsive to a public records request, the DCSO received a letter that personnel files were exempt from disclosure but confirmed van der Kamp had been a reserve officer from February 24, 1995, to January 28, 1997. The DCSO went through a court process in California to gain access to the records and learned that during van der Kamp’s time as a reserve officer at the LMPD, there were internal investigations that alleged van der Kamp had been dishonest and that his employment was terminated. A Rolodex card remained in the LMPD Chief’s office that identified van der Kamp by date of hire, date of separation, and demographic information. The card noted van der Kamp had been “terminated” from the LMPD.

Records from the LMPD indicate that during the time van der Kamp was a reserve officer with the LMPD, he worked as a sworn officer, in uniform, working with regular officers and alone. As a reserve officer, van der Kamp answered calls for service, investigated crimes, made criminal arrests, and issued citations.

The DCSO officers also contacted the LAPD and found that van der Kamp had been a reserve officer with the LAPD from October 28, 1991, until September 3, 1992. The LAPD records showed van der Kamp's status as "terminated"; however, it was explained that the notation of terminated could be applied to records of any individual who leaves the reserve program and does not necessarily have a negative connotation.

Records from the LMPD indicate that on January 22, 1996, an Internal Affairs (IA) investigation began to address several concerns that had been reported by officers regarding van der Kamp's actions on duty as a reserve officer.

Several memos were reviewed with concerns that van der Kamp was keeping inaccurate logs. Two allegations were sustained for "violating three department policies involving inaccuracy and incompleteness of daily logs; inaccuracy of relevant detailing all reports and making inaccurate, false or improper entries in any department document."

These allegations resulted in van der Kamp's January 29, 1996 assignment to a retraining program with a master officer. The program was completed on March 2, 1996. According to the retraining program report, during this training, van der Kamp issued three citations, impounded two vehicles, wrote two crime reports, and made three arrests. (LMPD Reserves Field Training Guide page 101 of 110)

Other allegations in the LMPD IA investigation involved van der Kamp administering field sobriety tests as part of a traffic stop/Driving Under the Influence (DUI) check without notifying dispatch he was conducting a DUI check or having a cover officer present. A second allegation involved a 1995 vehicle pursuit that resulted in errors of procedure during the pursuit and errors in report writing following the incident.

It was recommended that these allegations not be sustained as van der Kamp had attended a retraining phase regarding officer safety and arrest procedures.

A memo in the LMPD IA packet dated January 18, 1996, alleged that van der Kamp utilized a radar unit for speed violation enforcement without proper training or certification. When asked, van der Kamp indicated he took a class with the LAPD but did not have a copy of his certificate. According to the LMPD IA memo, van der Kamp said he wrote to LAPD for a copy of his certificate. At the time of the memo, van der Kamp had not provided LMPD with proof of training with a radar unit. The memo further states that on August 15, 1996, LMPD requested a training record from the LAPD to show training or certification regarding the use of a radar unit. The LAPD sent a reply to the LMPD on September 17, 1996, explaining that the LAPD did not provide radar equipment training to its reserve officers, nor did the LAPD have any record of such training for van der Kamp (LAPD memo dated January 18, 1996). No certification or training regarding the use of a radar unit was reflected in van der Kamp's California POST training record report or the records from the radar manufacturer.

Serious misconduct violations were sustained against van der Kamp, including the use of radar equipment without required training and misleading the department about receiving radar

training “in violation of standards of conduct including but not limited to making false or misleading statements, dishonest behavior, and deception”.

A memo to the Chief of the LMPD dated January 6, 1997, concluded by stating “Res. Off. Vander Kamp’s actions represent serious incidents of misconduct which bear directly on his credibility. For that reason, I recommend that he be dismissed from his position as a reserve police officer.” (January 6, 1997, City of La Mesa Interoffice Memo, page 8)

No letter or document from the LMPD was located terminating van der Kamp’s employment, however, there was a Rolodex card in the LMPD chief’s office with van der Kamp’s name, and “terminated” was recorded. Records from the California POST also indicated he was discharged from LMPD.

In a January 9, 2024, news article in the Oregon Bend Bulletin, van der Kamp told the Bulletin he didn’t recall how he left the LMPD, stating “it was a volunteer position in which he directed traffic and people. It wasn’t really law enforcement.”

On May 23, 2024, the independent investigator contracted by the DCSO to investigate an unrelated matter interviewed van der Kamp for a separate investigation. The investigator stated van der Kamp was provided with and signed a Garrity Warning and truthfulness admonition statement. At the beginning of the interview, when discussing van der Kamp’s previous law enforcement experience, van der Kamp verbally denied having any law enforcement experience before joining the DCSO. (transcript of May 23, 2024, interview, page 2)

A letter dated August 10 2024, titled “An update from Kent Vander Kamp; A sincere apology and clarification regarding my volunteer experience 27 years ago” was posted on van der Kamp’s campaign website and states; “However, after completing the college program and volunteering in late 1997, I was apparently dismissed from the volunteer position for using speed radar equipment without proper certification...I only recently learned of my dismissal through these internal documents after reading them for the first time yesterday.” Although the provided documents did not include any dismissal or notice of discipline correspondence addressed to me, I acknowledge these mistakes, and they are embarrassing to me.”

As part of the independent investigation, van der Kamp participated in an interview on September 18, 2024.

During his interview, van der Kamp told the investigator that he was involved in reserve programs through both the LAPD and the LMPD. He stated he was an explorer scout when he was involved with the LAPD and started working with the LMPD as part of a college class through Grossmont College. Van der Kamp stated he did not recall being a part of an IA investigation while he was at the LMPD.

Van der Kamp described his duties as a reserve officer with the LMPD... “well, we couldn’t do anything on our own. We took classes, and we had to write reports to our professor, and we had homework assignments and then...but we would do Christmas parades and wear our little polo shirts, and then we would help old ladies to their cars with their Christmas packages. And I was only there for two Christmases, I think. It was so long ago I don’t remember all the details, but it was very minimal.” (November 21, 2024, Report of Investigation, page 17)

When asked about specific duties performed as a reserve officer, van der Kamp said he could not remember if he ever qualified with a firearm as an LMPD reserve officer. When asked if he had

made arrests or issued citations, van der Kamp stated “I would imagine there was a time in training where they would teach us how to fill out citations, but I couldn’t name a specific time or place” He stated he could not recall ever making an arrest, using force on someone or engaging in a vehicle pursuit as a driver when an LMPD reserve officer. Van der Kamp stated he took phone reports but stated he did not recall ever writing a police report on a call for service or from taking police action.

Of note, in an interoffice memo dated January 7, 1996, an LMPD sergeant expressed concern, stating “It appears more and more that Vander Kamp is not willing to do the work of a reserve and is spending all his time writing tickets, making arrests and conducting himself like an aggressive police officer...there is evidence that he is heavy handed and irresponsible regarding his reserve duties.”

When asked about previous internal affairs investigations at the LMPD, van der Kamp stated he had no independent recollection of that, nor did he recall being limited in his duties or being assigned remedial training due to findings in an internal investigation.

In 2004, when van der Kamp completed his initial background investigation with the DCSO, he did not mention any previous training or volunteer work experience with the LMPD, indicating on his background form “DNA” (Does Not Apply). On his second background form in 2008, when he was hired as a full-time deputy with the DCSO, he reported his previous DCSO reserve deputy training and work with the DCSO’s Search and Rescue team but did not put any experience or training from his time as a reserve police officer in California. When asked by the special investigator why his training and work experience with the LMPD or the LAPD was not reported, van der Kamp indicated he did not think of it as a job because he was paying tuition to Grossmont College to be at the LMPD.

The independent investigator found:

Vander Kamp is not credible, based on his statement in his two interviews with me and based upon a review and analysis of documentary evidence and witness statements as articulated in this report. Vander Kamp has a personal stake in the outcome of the issues under investigation, about which he was untruthful. In the September 18, 2024 interview, when asked direct questions that had a bearing on his culpability, Vander Kamp often answered “no”, or answered that he did not recall, or answered that he did not remember. In contrast, Vander Kamp often recalled specific details and gave explanations as answers to questions that did not have direct bearing on his culpability. Many of Vander Kamp’s statements are contradicted by documentary and witness evidence. Vander Kamp was evasive and engaged in deflection and minimization when answering direct questions about his actions and conduct. Furthermore, Vander Kamp was untruthful in the May 2024 interview (2024-IA-0002), supporting the determination that he is not credible. (November 21, 2024, Report of Investigation, page 10)

On September 30, 2024, van der Kamp was interviewed on KBND radio and stated he had come to the DCSO 22 years prior as a search and rescue volunteer and minimized his work as a reserve officer with the LMPD, describing it as the result of his last college term. He stated he disclosed this experience in his DCSO background investigation packet through his college transcripts.

In an October 9, 2024, article with Oregon Public Broadcasting (OPB), in which records from the LMPD were inadvertently released, van der Kamp is quoted as saying, “Their records were incomplete...The whole thing is a farce.”

The Department records submitted by van der Kamp were reviewed. In five of the forms, the question “Have you been discharged from a public agency” was asked. van der Kamp indicated “no” to this question on the following forms:

F5-Application for supervisor training, signed on August 22, 2017 (question 13C).

F7-Application for advanced certification, signed on April 20, 2014 (question 15).

F7-Application for intermediate certification, signed on September 15, 2010 (question 15).

F7-Application for basic certification, signed on July 1, 2009 (question 15).

F5-Application for training, Basic Police, class 08-310, signed on September 17, 2008 (question 14C).

Before the signature, the forms state, “I understand that a false or misleading statement on this document makes me subject to penalty...and is cause to deny or revoke public safety officer certification.”

In his interview on September 18, 2024, van der Kamp was asked why he had indicated that he had not been discharged from a public agency on a specific DPSST F7 form signed July 1, 2009. van der Kamp stated, “At the time I signed the form, I believed it was correct.”

The independent investigator completed his investigation on November 21, 2024, and SUSTAINED both reported allegations, stating:

Vander Kamp failed to disclose to DCSO information concerning his employment and association with both the Los Angeles Police Department as a reserve officer and as a police reserve officer with the La Mesa Police Department during the 2004 DCSO reserve deputy background investigation and on many other occasions over the past 20 years.

Vander Kamp continued engaging in dishonest acts about this matter by failing to disclose to DCSO information concerning his employment and association with both the LAPD as a reserve officer and as a police reserve officer during the 2008 DCSO regular deputy sheriff background investigation.

Vander Kamp continued engaging in dishonest acts about this matter by certifying his signature on at least five DPSST forms from 2008 to 2017 that he had never been terminated for cause from the LMPD as a reserve police officer in January 1997

Vander Kamp continued engaging in dishonest acts about this matter during a May 2024 interview on an unrelated internal affairs case. In that interview, when Vander Kamp was asked if he had any law enforcement experience prior to DCSO, which Vander Kamp answered “Nope” (November 21, 2024, Report of Investigation, page 40-41).

The independent investigator stated, “Many if not most of Vander Kamp's statements are contradicted by factual documentary evidence. Vander Kamp was often evasive and used deflection and minimization when answering direct questions about his actions and conduct.”

On April 7, 2025, the Department became aware that the DCDAO had completed an investigation and determined van der Kamp gave untruthful statements regarding his education while testifying in criminal cases while under oath.

The Department requested a copy of the investigation, which was received on April 9, 2024. In at least three criminal cases (June 12, 2013, October 3, 2013, and November 3, 2015), van der Kamp, as part of his testimony, provided information about his education that was not factual. He provided information on a curriculum vitae (CV) that he attended the University of Arizona and the University of Southern California and completed degrees when, in fact, he attended neither institution. These CVs, required to be submitted to the Oregon State Police for van der Kamp's certification as a Drug Recognition Expert (DRE), were submitted to the court during sworn testimony as factual.

Additionally, in the hearing on June 12, 2013, van der Kamp was asked, under oath, "Do you have any prior law enforcement experience prior to working with the Deschutes County Sheriff's Office?" van der Kamp answered, "No, sir. I hadn't". In a hearing on November 3, 2015, van der Kamp was asked while testifying under oath, "All right. And your training as a deputy, has it all been in Deschutes County? Or in Oregon?", van der Kamp answered "My training? Yes". This is in contrast to the fact that van der Kamp previously worked as a reserve officer in California

As a result of this investigation, the DCDAO stated:

Based on the totality of the circumstances, we have significant concerns about Sheriff Vander Kamp's credibility and veracity. His past false testimony, coupled with his fraudulent past CVs, are so interwoven to such an extent that they demonstrate a continuing pattern of dishonesty from 2013-2017.

In fulfilling our prosecutorial function, we understand that we as prosecutors are to consider not only our constitution and ethical duties, but also whether we "in good conscience," could obtain a conviction using Sheriff Vander Kamp's testimony...we do not believe that in good conscience we can call Sheriff Vander Kamp as a witness in future criminal proceedings.

Vander Kamp will be placed in the internal DCDAO Brady list; he will not be called as a witness in any future criminal proceedings by the DCDAO...

As a result of this decision, and consistent with our policies and procedures, we will continue to examine those past criminal cases in which Sheriff Vander Kamp testified. If his testimony is found to be untruthful, we will take any and all necessary actions to protect the rights of criminal defendants as well as the integrity of the justice system.

Relevant Circumstances for Consideration

Van der Kamp obtained basic, intermediate, advanced, and supervisory police certifications.

Van der Kamp has been employed in public safety for 20.5 years.

If the committee recommends action in this case, the start date for an ineligibility period would be based on the board review.

An email from DCSO received on December 18, 2024, indicated a corrected spelling of the surname van der Kamp, which is used in this document. Many exhibits show the surname spelled Vander Kamp, including a transcript from van der Kamp's interview with the special investigator. The spelling Vander Kamp is kept in this document when quoting a source.

A complaint received on March 4, 2025, expressed concerns about how the complaint against van der Kamp was brought forward and included leadership concerns of the agency under

former Sheriff Shane Nelson. The March 4, 2025, complaint is included in this document for informational purposes.

On April 23, 2025, the Department received a USB drive that contained audio recordings of the testimony provided by van der Kamp as a witness in the three criminal cases referenced by DCDAO in their Brady investigation. The Department was able to listen to the testimony and verify that the statements in the written transcript were consistent with the audio recordings.

Exhibits Reference	
DPSST Employee Profile Report	A1
Independent Investigation Report from Jim Ferraris dated November 1, 2024, with listed exhibits	A2
Memo from the DCSO Sheriff	A3
Garrity document 2024-IA-0002 and 2024-IA-0006	A4
Jim Ferraris- Audio interview with Kyle Joye, October 16, 2024	A5
Jim Ferraris- Phone call with Carl Wirtz LMPD (ret.)	A6
Jim Ferraris- Phone call with Glorie Sacco LMPD (ret.)	A7
Jim Ferraris- Phone interview with Alan Lanning, LMPD	A8
Memo from Undersheriff dated 12/5/2024 and legal counsel David Doyle dated 11/14/2024	A9
Investigation response memo from DCSO Undersheriff dated 12/30/24	A10
Memo from Undersheriff Paul Garrison dated 11/26/2024- closure of complaint 2024-C-0021- unfounded	A11
August 10, 2024, Letter of apology from van der Kamp campaign website	A12
Interview with KBND Radio, September 30, 2024	A13
OPB articles dated September 19, 2024; October 9, 2024; October 24, 2024; and March 11, 2025	A14
F4 Personnel Action Form (F4) signed December 11, 2024	A15
Complaint and email received on March 4, 2025	A16
Letter of support from John Trumbo	A17
DCDAO Brady Investigation	A18
OPB article dated April 14, 2024	A19

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY STANDARDS AND TRAINING

STATE OF OREGON

**In the Matter of the Proposed Revocation
of the Basic, Intermediate, Advanced,
and Supervisory Police Certifications
Issued to:**

**NOTICE OF PROPOSED REVOCATION OF
CERTIFICATIONS AND PROPOSED/FINAL
ORDER ON DEFAULT**

Kent van der Kamp
Respondent
DPSST No. 44640

TO: Kent van der Kamp

The Department of Public Safety Standards and Training (Department) proposes to revoke the Respondent's Basic, Intermediate, Advanced, and Supervisory Police Certifications pursuant to its authority in Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) 181A.410 and ORS 181A.640. The Department proposes revocation because the Respondent does not meet the moral fitness standards required of a public safety professional pursuant to Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) 259-008-0010(6), OAR 259-008-0300(3)(a)(A), and OAR 259-008-0300(3)(a)(C)(i). The Department's proposed revocation is based on the following:

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Respondent Kent van der Kamp("van der Kamp" or "Respondent") currently holds Basic, Intermediate, Advanced, and Supervisory Police Certifications.
2. On August 23, 2004, the Respondent was hired by the Deschutes County Sheriff's Office (DCSO) as a reserve officer. The Respondent was hired as a deputy with the DCSO on October 1, 2008.
3. On November 18, 2008, the Respondent signed the DPSST Criminal Justice Code of Ethics form (F11).
4. As the result of a jurisdictional complaint forwarded by the Department to the DCSO, an internal investigation was conducted by the DCSO, and an independent

investigator was appointed. Per OAR 259-008-0300(3)(a)(b)(F), the Department reviewed the completed investigation and found that the Respondent may have violated Board-established employment, training, or certification standards for public safety professionals.

5. On April 7, 2025, the Deschutes County District Attorney's Office (DCDAO) notified the Department that they had completed an investigation related to false/misleading statements the Respondent made regarding his education while he was testifying under oath. As a result of this investigation, the Respondent was placed on Deschutes County's Tier I Brady list.
6. The Department has determined that the Respondent violated moral fitness pursuant to OAR 259-008-0300(3)(a)(A) and OAR 259-008-0300(3)(a)(C)(i) and proposes to revoke the Respondent's public safety certifications.

ULTIMATE FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Pursuant to ORS 181A.4109(a), the Board on Public Safety Standards and Training ("Board"), established by rule, reasonable minimum requirements of moral fitness for public safety professionals. Pursuant to this authority, the Board and the policy committees have adopted OAR 259-008-0010(6), which requires all public safety professionals to meet the minimum moral fitness standards for certification as established in the rule by the Board and the policy committees.
2. The Department is charged with implementing the moral fitness standards and may propose to revoke a public safety professional's certifications when the public safety professional has violated the moral fitness standards for certification defined in OAR 259-008-0300.
3. Under OAR 259-008-0300(3)(a), the Department may revoke a public safety professional's certifications based upon the finding that the public safety professional:
 - (a)...engaged in conduct that includes any or all of the following elements:
 - (A) Dishonesty. Dishonesty is intentional conduct that includes untruthfulness,

1 dishonesty by admission or omission, deception, misrepresentation, falsification or
2 reckless disregard for the truth;

3 (B) Misuse of Authority. Misuse of Authority is intentional conduct that includes the
4 use or attempted use of one's position or authority as a public safety professional to
5 obtain a benefit, avoid a detriment, or harm another; or

6 (C) Misconduct.

7 (i) Misconduct includes conduct that violates criminal laws, conduct that threatens or
8 harms persons, property, or the efficient operations of any agency, or discriminatory
9 conduct.

10 (ii) For the purposes of this rule, discriminatory conduct includes a pattern of conduct
11 or a single egregious act that evidences knowing and intentional discrimination based
12 on the perception of a person's race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender
13 identity, national origin, disability, age or any protected class as defined by state or
14 federal law, and would lead an objectively reasonable person to conclude that the
15 public safety professional cannot perform the duties of office in a fair and impartial
16 manner.

17 4. The Respondent engaged in conduct involving dishonesty:

18 a. The Respondent was intentionally dishonest when he omitted previous
19 employment or volunteer work as an Explorer Scout/reserve police officer
20 with the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) and a reserve police officer
21 with the La Mesa Police Department (LMPD) during his employment
22 background investigation processes in 2004 and 2008 with the DCSO.

23 b. The Respondent was intentionally dishonest when he omitted that he was
terminated for cause from his position as a reserve police officer from the
LMPD.

c. The Respondent was intentionally dishonest when he reported on five separate
forms submitted to the Department from 2008 to 2017 that he had not been

1 discharged from a public agency.

- 2 d. The Respondent was intentionally dishonest during his interviews with the
3 independent investigator on May 23, 2024, and September 18, 2024.
- 4 e. The Respondent gave false or misleading information while under oath
5 regarding his education in three criminal trials: June 12, 2013, October 3,
6 2013, and November 3, 2015 in Deschutes County, Oregon.
- 7 f. The Respondent omitted information regarding his previous work as a reserve
8 officer in La Mesa, California, while testifying under oath in criminal trials on
9 June 12, 2013, and November 3, 2015.

10 The Respondent's conduct is evidence of the Respondent's failure to meet the
11 moral fitness standards in OAR 259-008-0300(3)(a)(A), which specifically
12 provides that the Department may revoke a certification based on conduct
13 involving dishonesty. The Respondent's violation of OAR 259-008-
14 0300(3)(a)(A) is a separate and sufficient basis to revoke the Respondent's public
15 safety professional certifications.

16 5. The Respondent engaged in conduct involving misconduct:

- 17 a. The Respondent harmed the efficient operations of the DCSO and the public's
18 trust by intentionally falsifying documents submitted to the Department
19 stating he had not been discharged for cause from a public agency, by
20 providing incorrect information on his DCSO background investigation,
21 impacting the DCSO's ability to interview previous law enforcement agencies
22 regarding the Respondent's performance and conduct as a reserve officer, and
23 by giving misleading public statements and misleading statements to an
independent investigator.
- b. The Respondent threatened or harmed the efficient operation of the DCDAO
and the DCSO when the Respondent provided false testimony while under
oath that resulted in the DA placing the Respondent on the county's Brady
list. Given this designation, the DCDAO will be reviewing court cases

1 involving the Respondent's testimony to determine if any action should be
2 taken to protect the rights of criminal defendants and the justice system. The
3 Respondent's dishonesty under oath discredits the law enforcement profession
4 and the standing of the DCSO in the community. This dishonesty and the
5 potential reversal of justice found through court processes threatens the
6 efficient operations of the DCSO due to the negative impact of his dishonesty
7 to the community.

8 The Respondent's conduct is evidence of the Respondent's failure to meet the moral
9 fitness standards in OAR 259-008-0300(3)(a)(C)(i), which specifically provides that
10 the Department may revoke a certification based on conduct involving misconduct.
11 The Respondent's violation of OAR 259-008-0300(3)(a)(C)(i) is a separate and
12 sufficient basis to revoke the Respondent's public safety professional certifications.

13 6. Each of these grounds is a separate and distinct basis supporting a finding that the
14 public safety professional does not meet the moral fitness standards required by OAR
15 259-08-0010(6) and defined in 259-008-0300(3)(a)(A) and 259-008-300(3)(a)(C)(i).
16 The Department is not required to prove that all grounds stated hereinabove, or
17 violations exist to revoke the Respondent's certifications.

18 7. Pursuant to OAR 259-008-0310(10)(c)(A), there were aggravating circumstances
19 identified in the Respondent's case. The committee found:

- 20 a. The Respondent's conduct included an overwhelming amount of inaccuracies,
21 responses, and statements that clearly fall into the category of moral fitness
22 violations for dishonesty.
- 23 b. Written mitigation adds to the aggravating nature of this case.
- c. Where there were inconsistencies or discrepancies, the Respondent minimized his
actions.
- d. The Respondent clearly has extended service time, as a reserve in California,
performing law enforcement duties with regular officers and solo work.

- 1 e. The Respondent made a point not to talk about unpaid work as a reserve in
2 California and did not include it in his background investigation, but included
3 DCSO search & rescue experience, which is also unpaid, and classified that as
4 law enforcement experience.
- 5 f. The Respondent continued assertion that providing a college transcript with a
6 class title is sufficient for a law enforcement agency to research and find out what
7 exactly he was doing.
- 8 g. There is no valid reason why the Respondent would not include experience as an
9 unpaid reserve in the background information unless the experience was negative,
10 especially considering the time of the application in the 90s, when law
11 enforcement was a sought-after profession.
- 12 h. The documentation from the LMPD that the Respondent was a very active reserve
13 officer is significant experience that one would want to include in an application
14 process; however, the Respondent did not do so.
- 15 i. Continued denial by van der Kamp, even after documentation was received from
16 LMPD and LAPD to show that the information regarding his work as an Explorer
17 Scout/reserve officer was factual.
- 18 j. When the Respondent was confronted with documentation from the LMPD and
19 LAPD, the Respondent did not provide a solid no or denial, but simply replied, he
20 did not recall.
- 21 k. The Respondent blamed the written information on his Curriculum Vitae (CV) on
22 a third party, which was difficult to believe. Proofreading a CV is a reasonable
23 expectation.
- l. The CV the Respondent submitted showed college degrees from universities he
did not attend. The Respondent then testified to that information, which is beyond
logic.
- m. The Respondent provided multiple CVs that change information multiple times

1 throughout the years.

2 n. Although it is possible to make a mistake on a CV, it is hard to understand how
3 the Respondent testified under oath to an educational background that he did not
4 obtain.

5 o. The Deschutes County District Attorney's report and subsequent Brady
6 designation are aggravating.

7 p. The Respondent stated he did not put previous law enforcement experience on his
8 application/background investigation because it was college credits that he was
9 paying for, and he did not consider it employment. However, he had no problem
10 sharing that previous experience with his Field Training Officer (FTO) because it
11 could be used as a consideration to accelerate his Field Training Program.

12 8. Pursuant to OAR 259-008-0310(10)(c)(B), there were no mitigating circumstances
13 identified by the policy committee in the Respondent's case.

14 9. The Respondent's conduct is substantially related to the Respondent's fitness and
15 ability to perform the duties of a certified police officer. The Respondent's behavior
16 directly violates the Criminal Justice Code of Ethics and compromises the public's
17 trust in the public safety profession. The Respondent failed to disclose former
18 employment/training in law enforcement on two DCSO background investigations,
19 failed to disclose that he was terminated from a public agency on DPSST forms, gave
20 dishonest/misleading statements to an independent investigator and made
21 dishonest/misleading statements while testifying, under oath, in three criminal cases,
22 resulting in placement on the Deschutes County's Brady List. This behavior adversely
23 reflects on the public safety profession. The Respondent's conduct has compromised
their integrity and renders them ineffective to serve in public safety.

10. After review of the facts and weighing the identified aggravating and mitigating
circumstances unique to this case, the Department proposes that the Respondent's
certifications be revoked.

1
2
3
4
5
6
CONCLUSION OF LAW

The Department may revoke a public safety professional's certification if the public safety professional does not meet the minimum requirement of good moral fitness required pursuant to ORS 181A.410, ORS 181A.640, and OAR 259-008-0010(6). Based on the Respondent's conduct, the Respondent does not meet the minimum moral fitness standards in OAR 259-008-0010(6) and OAR 259-008-0300(3)(a)(A) and 259-008-0300(a)(C)(i).

7
8
9
10
11
12
PROPOSED/FINAL ORDER

The Respondent's Basic, Intermediate, Advanced, and Supervisory Police Certifications are hereby REVOKED. The Respondent's ineligibility period during which they may not apply for any public safety professional certifications is for a lifetime pursuant to OAR 259-008-0310(10)(d)(A).

13
14
15
16
17
18
NOTICE OF RIGHT TO A

19
20
21
22
23
HEARING AND ISSUANCE OF

DEFAULT FINAL ORDER

You are entitled to a contested case hearing as provided by the Administrative Procedures Act (ORS Chapter 183) and the administrative rules of the Department. If you wish to receive a hearing, you must file your request in writing with the Department no later than 20 (twenty) days from the service date.

If this Notice was served to you in person, the service date is the date you received this Notice. If the Notice was served through the mail, the service date is the date the Notice was mailed, not the date you received it.

Your request may be submitted by mail to the address below or by email to cindy.park@dpsst.oregon.gov, or by facsimile at 503-378-4600.

Department of Public Safety Standards and Training
Cindy Park
4190 Aumsville Hwy, SE
Salem, Oregon 97317

1 If a request for hearing is not received within 20 (twenty) days, your right to a hearing is
2 considered waived unless the failure to request a hearing was beyond your reasonable control.
3 For a hearing request that is mailed to be timely, it must be postmarked within 20 (twenty) days
4 from the date of service of this Notice. If the hearing request is submitted by email or facsimile,
5 it must be received by the Department by 5:00 p.m. PT within 20 (twenty) days from the date the
6 Notice is mailed. If you do not submit a timely request for a hearing, your right to a hearing shall
7 be considered waived.

8 You have the right to be represented by legal counsel. Legal aid organizations may be
9 able to assist a party with limited financial resources.

10 When the Department receives a request for a hearing, it will refer the matter to the
11 Office of Administrative Hearings, which will designate the time and place for the hearing. You
12 will receive information on the procedure, right of representation, and other rights of parties
13 relating to the conduct of the hearing before the commencement of the hearing. The hearing will
14 be conducted according to the Administrative Procedure Act (ORS Chapter 83), Attorney
15 General's Rules of the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAR Chapter 137), and the
16 Department's Administrative Rules (Chapter 259 Divisions 05 and 08).

17 If you fail to request a hearing within the time specified above, withdraw a hearing
18 request, notify the Department or the administrative law judge that you will not appear, or fail to
19 appear at a scheduled hearing, is deemed invalid under OAR 137-003-0550(4), this Notice of
20 Proposed Revocation of Certifications and Proposed/Final Order on Default automatically
21 becomes a Final Order by Default, effective upon Board affirmation. In the event of a default,
22 the Department designates the file, including any materials you submitted that relate to this
23 matter, as the record for the purpose of proving a prima facie case supporting its Final Order by
24 default.

25 You are entitled to judicial review of any Final Order issued in the matter of this Notice
26 of Proposed Revocation of Certifications and Proposed/Final Order on Default in accordance
27 with ORS 183.482. You may request judicial review by filing a petition with the Court of
28 Appeals in Salem, Oregon, within 60 (sixty) days from the date of this order if it becomes a Final
29 Order.

1
2 **Notice to Active-Duty Servicemembers.** Active-duty service members are entitled to
3 stay these proceedings under the federal Servicemembers Civil Relief Act, 50 U.S.C. App. 501.
4 You may contact the Oregon State Bar toll-free at (800) 452-8260, the Oregon Military
5 Department toll-free at (800) 511-6944, or the United States Armed Forces Legal Assistance
6 Legal Services Locator via the web at: **Armed Forces Legal Assistance (AFLA)** or
legalassistance.law.af.mil for assistance.

7 IT IS SO ORDERED THIS 11 day of June 2025.

8 

9 _____
10 Phil Castle, Agency Director
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY STANDARDS AND TRAINING

STATE OF OREGON

In the Matter of the Proposed revocation of the
Basic, Intermediate, Advanced and Supervisory
Police Certifications issued to:

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Kent van der Kamp
Respondent
DPSST No. 44640

I certify that on the 11 day of June, 2025, I served the foregoing *Notice of Proposed Revocation of Certifications and Proposed/Final Order by Default* on the party hereto by mailing, by regular mail, postage prepaid and certified mail, return receipt requested, true, exact and full copies thereof to:

Kent van der Kamp

Andrew Mittendorf, JD
Employment Law Professional Northwest, LLC
20015 SW Pacific Hwy, Suite 221
Sherwood, OR 97140

Via Electronic Mail
Andrew Mittendorf, JD
andrew@elpnw.com

Department of Public Safety Standards & Training

By: Cindy Park

Cindy Park
Professional Standards Compliance Coordinator