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 DCDSO 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 Kamps 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.	
Exhibits Reference	
DPSST Employee Profile Report	A1
Independent Investigation Report from Jim Farris 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 Farris- Audio interview with Kyle Joye, October 16, 2024	A5
Jim Farris- Phone call with Carl Wirtz LMPD (ret.)	A6
Jim Farris- Phone call with Glorie Sacco LMPD (ret.)	A7
Jim Farris- 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