MEMORANDUM

TO:         Mike Gottfredson, President
FROM:       Jamie Moffitt, Vice President, Finance and Administration/CFO
SUBJECT:    Arming of UO Police Department
DATE:       May 20, 2013

Attached is a memorandum from UO Police Department (UOPD) Interim Chief Carolyn McDermid in which she recommends that we seek approval to allow the arming of UOPD sworn police officers. Other documents attached include a comprehensive overview of campus and community outreach and communication activities surrounding the arming issue, and an overview of steps taken to train and prepare UOPD officers.

Chief McDermid's memorandum and supporting documents present a thorough and compelling case. Rather than restate many of the points made in the attached recommendation, I will simply state that I agree with Chief McDermid's analysis and support her recommendation to seek approval to allow the arming of the UO's sworn police officers. I believe the ability to arm our sworn police officers will greatly enhance our ability to provide a safe campus environment for students, faculty, staff and visitors.
May 20, 2013

Jamie Moffitt
Vice President for Finance and Administration
103 Johnson Hall, University of Oregon

A recommendation to arm UO police officers from Interim Police Chief Carolyn McDermed to Vice President for Finance and Administration Jamie Moffitt

For the University of Oregon to provide the full range of needed police services and protection for university students, members of the faculty and staff, and police officers, I recommend the institution be permitted to arm University of Oregon Police Department (UOPD) sworn police officers.

I make this recommendation after much consideration and application of 30 years of experience in law enforcement, including five years at the University of Oregon and 17 as an officer and commander with the Eugene Police Department.

I chose to join the university community because I believe deeply in its academic mission. Since coming to the UO, I have been privileged to get to know the campus and its many communities and cultures. In close collaboration with officers and staff in the UO’s safety department as well as with colleagues from around campus, I have learned about the university’s many strengths and, of perhaps greater concern, its vulnerabilities.

From a law enforcement perspective, campus concerns like theft, suspicious subjects, disorderly behavior, vandalism, harassment, drug and alcohol abuse and sexual assault often cross jurisdictional lines. The community-wide priorities of the Eugene Police Department, with which I am intimately familiar, place first the needs of the greater community — not always those of the University of Oregon. That means that officers with the Eugene Police Department cannot always assist at the level or in the timeframe that the University of Oregon community requires.

The university has experienced tremendous growth and evolution in recent years. As a result, the needs and expectations of those on and around campus have long eclipsed the capacity for a limited “campus safety” department, even with support from Eugene Police. Further compounding the issue are the severe resource constraints under which local municipal agencies are operating.

On most days, the University of Oregon would, as a stand-alone entity, rank as the 18th largest city in Oregon. The UO’s 295-acre campus boasts almost 5,000 residents and attracts more than 30,000 students, employees, and visitors each day.
With those many factors in mind, I believe it is appropriate and necessary to have a full-service, state-certified police agency working for this institution to provide much-needed services to UO students and members of the faculty and staff.

Deploying armed police officers would allow the department to best meet the needs of the community and to deliver full value for the university's investment, providing a higher level of service with shorter response times.

Gradually, the UOPD would take full responsibility for the vast majority of law enforcement needs of campus constituents. Doing so, however, requires officers to use standard law enforcement tools and to follow strict professional standards for safety. These standards dictate that some key services are performed only by armed officers. These include transporting arrestees, making traffic stops, confronting armed and dangerous individuals, making certain arrests, serving warrants and doing investigations at unknown or unsecured locations. In order to provide additional context, I have included as an attachment to this letter a document that outlines some best practices as they relate to the arming of U.S. police officers, both on college campuses and elsewhere.

Every week, we see cases where the UOPD's inability to meet these professional standards severely limits its ability to serve and protect. With proper equipment, the UOPD could have provided superior service in each of the recent cases below.

- In November 2012, UOPD arrested a bike theft suspect who had stolen bike parts, drugs, drug paraphernalia and burglary tools. He was arrested on campus property by campus officers; however, UOPD — with unarmed officers — could not transport him to jail and requested Eugene Police Department transportation by its armed officers. But because of EPD's strained resources, they were unable to respond and the suspect was cited for misdemeanors and released.

- In February 2013, UOPD was unable to quickly gather evidence in a case where a student's credit cards and ID were stolen and used in an area supermarket because it is unable to perform off-campus investigations.

- Also in February 2013, UOPD dispatch received a call regarding an alleged man with a gun in an academic building (this report ultimately proved to be erroneous). Despite being on-scene within a few minutes, unarmed UOPD officers were unable to investigate, and forced to wait in a parking lot across the street from the building for Eugene Police officers to arrive several minutes later.

- In March 2013, UOPD would have been able to interview a subject suspected of harassing or threatening university students and employees.
• In April 2013, UOPD could have done an off-campus welfare check on a reportedly suicidal student.

• In May 2013, several 911 calls reported a man repeatedly shooting off a gun inside a UO-owned house. Unarmed UOPD officers responded quickly, and waited at a safe distance for Eugene Police officers to respond some time later.

An armed police department would also boost the levels of overall safety in other ways, too.

For example, we have all seen drivers speed through areas full of pedestrian and bicycling students. If officers could safely perform traffic stops, we could send a message that unsafe driving is not accepted on campus. This would reduce the number of traffic issues, which fortunately of late have been only near misses.

As noted above, armed campus police officers could transport arrestees to jail. This would allow the department to remove criminals or suspected criminals from campus. In addition, it would create a deterrent to those who now know that they have a much lower risk of going to jail when they commit crimes on campus.

Ultimately, however, officers carry firearms for their own protection in a hazardous line of work. These dangers in the every day line of duty present my gravest concerns.

Our department’s officers, both sworn and non-sworn, come into daily contact with convicted criminals. We routinely share internal memos to caution officers about known subjects in the area who have a history of violence or of being armed, in addition to their criminal records.

I am certain that regardless of institutional or departmental policies to the contrary, that if there was a deadly threat to the campus, our officers would do what they could to engage and neutralize it, even without being armed. After all, they have taken an oath to protect and serve.

But situations this year with unfounded reports of armed individuals have served to elevate my concerns. I am proud to say that our officers will always put the safety of others above their own. So it troubles me deeply to know those trained professionals are serving and protecting our community without basic tools to protect and aid themselves.

Though an institutionally run police department is new to the UO, armed police on campus are not. Police officers with guns have always been on the university campus, whether through contracted, dedicated Eugene Police Department
service as was the case in past years, or with the general EPD service campus currently has.

Yet as almost anyone who sets foot on our campus immediately realizes, the University of Oregon is a unique place. With unique places, come unique needs. With that in mind, there is actually tremendous advantage in allowing the university itself — and those most familiar with its needs — to shape how police services are provided. This allows the university to thoughtfully fit an armed police presence to the priorities and culture of the campus. The university's direct oversight of the department ensures that police will be a part of the institution, taking actions and setting priorities in lock step with the university's mission.

Such an arrangement also allows a police force to embed itself within campus culture. UOPD already works closely with campus community members, including student groups and other departments and offices, to meet the special needs of the university. It also partners with other state and local law enforcement agencies to provide the fastest, most appropriate and thorough responses to any campus safety issues. But our goal is not only to meet the needs of campus, but also to reflect its priorities.

It is my firm belief that we will meet and exceed the campus's expectations.

We realize that an armed police department on campus is a relatively new idea to the UO community. However, since spring 2012, UOPD supervisors and staff have met with hundreds of campus community members. At these meetings, we have discussed in very frank terms the issues of arming officers. The meetings have also allowed us learn about overall safety concerns to the campus community.

Here are some of the questions or concerns we consistently heard, along with our responses and plans to address them.

*How are officers trained to use weapons and wise judgment about force?*

If UOPD police officers were eventually armed, only sworn, commissioned police officers would be able to carry firearms on duty. Those officers have the same standards for initial and ongoing training as all police officers in the state regarding use of firearms, as well as following all of the department policies and professional guidelines regarding use of force and preferred alternatives to drawing or using firearms. In addition to the state requirements for police officer certification, UOPD requires that its officers be trained in other areas like first aid and CPR, multicultural competency, de-escalation techniques, and federal reporting mandates such as for the Clery Act and Title IX.

Non-sworn public safety officers would not carry firearms. Public safety officers
cannot achieve police officer status without being hired for a police opening and achieving all of the police standards. These include the four-month police academy, passing stringent background checks, and successfully completing four months of field training.

*How will officers reflect and respect campus diversity and a spirit of inclusion?*

This is one of the many areas where a police force tailored to the needs of campus has the opportunity to shine. UOPD is working with the Division of Student Affairs to develop and implement a thorough, rigorous, meaningful and mandatory multicultural excellence training process for all officers. As UOPD hires police officers, the department will look for the best, most-skilled candidates who can excel in the campus environment.

*How will officers deal with rallies and other speech issues?*

Free expression is a cornerstone of public universities, and UOPD absolutely supports that value. During protests and rallies, UOPD's mission is to help make sure people can express themselves safely, and within the law. UOPD may be on-scene to protect protesters and bystanders alike, while also ensuring access to campus buildings and services for students, employees and visitors.

One of the best questions we've received is “how will our police department fit the culture of this campus?”

The answer is that we will have the professionalism and high level of service that comes with real police officers and police resources, but with our service tailored to this campus. Campus policing is very different than other kinds of law enforcement. We know that we need to be patient, and to treat interactions with students as learning opportunities.

We have a unique ability to refer student cases to the university's student conduct office, instead of writing citations and sending students through the legal system. This is what we frequently do.

We also can focus our time and efforts on university priorities. We can work with all levels of the institution to develop effective prevention and response strategies. We can follow through on stolen bicycles and laptops. We can work with assault survivors to make the reporting process more supportive and less traumatic.

Some have said they feel intimidated by our uniforms and gear; others by the vehicles our officers drive. As long as our patrol ranks are adequately staffed to respond to urgent calls, we will have a greater on-foot and bicycle presence in the heart of campus. We'll also take advantage of opportunities to have officers act as
liaisons with student groups and to be involved with campus projects and activities outside of an enforcement role.

With commitment and dedicated follow-through from department leadership, we can address the majority of concerns that exist for some campus community members, and still carry out our full-service mission while being armed.

The University of Oregon Police Department would welcome the opportunity to serve campus with its fully trained police officers following best standards and practices, emphasizing community policing, and using standard tools of the trade with a sensitivity and an awareness as unique as the campus itself.

Sincerely,

Carolyn McDermid  
Interim Chief, University of Oregon Police Department

attachment
Best Practices Regarding Police Officer Arming

Prepared by University of Oregon Police Department Interim Chief Carolyn Mcelrath, spring 2013, for consideration by the University of Oregon executive leadership team and President Michael Goffredson

U.S. Collegiate Law Enforcement Convention

Providing safety, security and law enforcement services that prioritize campus culture and core missions has become a standard practice for most institutions of higher education in the U.S., including the University of Oregon.

Campuses often function as cities within cities (or towns within towns) with their own distinctive and complex geography, demographics and culture. The needs and expectations of students and employees have never been higher for the delivery of safety and security services. Meanwhile, municipal law enforcement and judicial systems at all levels have struggled to manage crime and prevention services in their broader communities. Without dedicated campus police, the specialized needs of college campuses frequently are a lower priority to local law enforcement, already challenged by dwindling resources.

The shootings at Virginia Tech University in 2007 spurred widespread reviews of campus safety practices and resulted in a host of state and national reports on best practices to prevent and respond to incidents of violence at institutions of higher education. These reports commonly recommend improving the training, equipment and professionalism of campus safety and police departments.

A 2008 survey by National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO) and other agencies (under the banner of the National Campus Safety and Security Project) showed that 97.5 percent of public four-year schools had campus police; 87.9 percent had sworn officers; and 75.9 percent had armed officers. Survey respondents included the full spectrum from small to large institutions (55.8 percent of respondents represented institutions of fewer than 4,000 students while 86.8 percent came from places with 15,000 or fewer).

Another campus safety report published after the Virginia Tech shootings directly recommends that “sworn campus police officers should be armed and trained in the use of personal or specialized firearms.” (“Campus Violence Prevention and Response: Best Practices for Massachusetts Higher Education,” a report prepared for the Massachusetts Board of Higher Education by consulting group Applied Risk Management, LLC, in June 2008)

“If the institution employs a full-service, sworn law enforcement agency, then the officers should have access to a range of use of force options including lethal (firearms) and less-than-lethal (impact tools, chemical, and electronic control devices). In short, sworn officers should be armed,” writes The International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators (IACLEA), in “The IACLEA Blueprint for Safer Campuses” (published in April 2008 by an IACLEA Special Review Task Force).

In the years since each of those items was published, we’ve seen more active shooters in more public places than any of us might have comprehended even a decade ago. In many of those cases, targets were students and educators of various ages and levels. Campus safety has never been as gravely important.
U.S. Law Enforcement Convention

In the United States, sworn law enforcement officers are armed as a norm, regardless of where they serve. This holds true for municipal, county, state and federal agencies. It holds true for both urban and rural agencies. It holds true regardless of the population the agency serves or the crime rate or nature of crime that traditionally has occurred within an agency's jurisdiction.

Some routine police duties are statistically very dangerous. Industry best practices require only armed police officers to deal with armed and dangerous subjects, respond to domestic disputes, transport suspects to jail, make traffic stops, and conduct investigations or serve arrest warrants or search warrants at residences and other unknown or unsecured locations.

Police officers are armed as a deterrent to those who might choose to use violence against officers or community members. Firearms are carried because officers at all levels, anywhere, cannot predict exactly what they will face. While on duty, sworn officers must confront criminals and other unknown or dangerous threats, and are obligated to engage.

Some individuals can only be deterred with a firearm; in those cases, less-lethal tools are ineffective and can cost a life.

When approaching and contacting suspicious individuals, the only thing an officer knows for sure is that the person has been suspected of committing a crime or has otherwise raised a safety or security concern. The officer has no way of initially knowing (and cannot possibly guarantee) that an individual or group is unarmed, non-violent and of sound mind.

The easy availability of firearms in the U.S., both legally and illegally, means that officers must be prepared for any potentially criminal subject to be armed.

In addition, across the country and especially in Eugene, the porous edges of university campuses make students and employees — many of whom we welcome to campus from around the world — inviting targets for criminals. The vast majority of suspicious subjects contacted on the UO campus are not members of the university community, but are known criminals with varying degrees of violent histories. The safety and security of students and employees is of first priority when officers contact these subjects.

A Definition of Arming — UO Police Department

In this context, arming means that sworn police officers employed by the University of Oregon Police Department would carry and be able to use firearms (guns). The standard tool would be a sidearm (handgun) carried regularly on officers' utility belts.

Currently, both sworn police officers with UOPD as well as the non-sworn public safety officers carry pepper spray and batons.

The department does not possess, use or currently plan to use, Tasers or other electric stun devices. As a professional police agency, the department will continuously assess its tools, equipment and standard practices for effectiveness and keep abreast of industry-recognized best practices.
Active-Shooter Considerations

While campus shootings are uncommon, they are an area of concern for every institution. No school can consider itself immune to the possibility of such an incident.

Prior to the school shootings at Columbine High School in Littleton, Colo., in 1999, law enforcement practice for an active shooter situation was for first responders to establish a perimeter and wait for a tactical unit to assemble at the scene to enter an area and engage the threat. The scrutiny of the Columbine tragedy revealed that this approach was flawed. While tactical resources assembled, many lives were lost.

Frequently in active shooter incidents, it is armed officers confronting the subject that brings the situation to an end (most often by the subject taking his own life). Thus, post-Columbine, standard law enforcement response calls for the first-responding armed officers to engage the subject as soon as possible to force an end to the incident.

Time is critical. With each second people wait for outside resources, the risk to human life increases dramatically. Armed campus police officers, who are familiar with campus buildings and their layout, will mean a significantly faster response and untold lives saved.

Conclusion

Nationwide in higher education, it is widely recognized that a professional campus police department is better able to handle university-wide needs more effectively than outside agencies. A familiarity with campus culture and geography, regular communication with campus leadership and specialized training and protocols that support campus goals and priorities combine to provide a foundation for law enforcement excellence.

To meet ever-increasing safety and security needs, U.S. higher education institutions, especially those with more than 15,000 students, have institution-operated, full-service police departments with thoroughly trained, certified and armed officers.

We realize that the University of Oregon is a unique place, with a unique culture. It is the unique needs of the institution that could be best served by a full-service police force, managed not by municipal authorities but university administrators best able to align law enforcement priorities with those of the institution overall.
Engaging the UO Campus on Police Officer Arming

Prepared by the campus working group on arming University of Oregon police officers, regarding the campus discussion of arming, for consideration by Vice President for Finance and Administration Jamie Moffitt and President Michael Goldfarb

May 13, 2013

Overview

Vice President for Finance and Administration Jamie Moffitt asked the Campus Working Group on Arming Police Officers (Working Group) to facilitate a campus-wide discussion about the possibility of arming officers of the University of Oregon Police Department (UOPD). The instruction and clear expectation was that the effort be thorough and comprehensive and that it contain an educational component as well as opportunities for students, faculty, staff, visitors and other campus stakeholders to provide input. The Working Group has completed its effort. This memorandum reports its conclusions.

Background

In 2011, Senate Bill 405 was passed by the Oregon Legislature and signed into law by Governor John Kitzhaber. It gave the Oregon University System the ability to create campus police departments.

After legislative approval, the Oregon State Board of Higher Education granted the University of Oregon’s request to implement a several-year plan to establish a sworn police department. As part of its action, the board set aside the decision to arm officers and asked that the university come back with a separate request when and if it wished to arm UOPD officers.

The University of Oregon Police Department, established in 2012, patrols campus 24 hours a day, year-round on foot, by bicycle and vehicle, and is responsible for campus safety, crime prevention and law enforcement. It provides the services for the 295 acres of main campus as well as to numerous university-owned or leased buildings and sites in Eugene and Springfield.

For the past year, with the help of the University of Oregon Implementation Advisory Group (an advisory group of students, faculty and staff) university leaders have been researching, analyzing and discussing campus police services, including the issue of arming UOPD police officers. The discussions were valuable to inform the campus engagement planning, as well as allow UOPD to provide information about campus policing and hear feedback about safety concerns from students, faculty and staff.

In addition to, and largely in advance of, the series of campus public meetings, UOPD leadership staff reached out to various campus representative groups to meet, explain the issues of possible arming and answer questions.

These representative groups included, but were not limited to:

- The Associated Students of the University of Oregon (ASUO) Executive Branch (stu-
dent government president, vice president, cabinet staff, etc.)

• ASUO Senate (a 20-seat body of elected student representatives)

• The Residence Hall Association (elected student governing representatives of on-campus residents)

• Family Housing Board (the appointed board of directors of the graduate and family housing program at the university)

• Erb Memorial Union Multicultural Center Board (representatives of various cultural student groups that are part of the memorial union)

• Black Student Union

• University Senate (elected representatives of faculty and officers of research, instruction and administration)

• Service Employees International Union Local 503, UO chapter (classified worker union)

• Officers of Administration Council (a non-union group representing administrators and professionals on campus)

• Graduate Teaching Fellow Federation (bargaining unit representing GTFs)

**Campus and Community Engagement Effort Overview**

To fulfill the university's commitment to the State Board of Higher Education and the UO Implementation Advisory Group, the Working Group convened in early January 2013 to expand communications efforts already underway by leaders within UOPD to include campus-wide events and electronic opportunities for campus discussion about the possibility of arming UO police officers. Near-campus residential and business neighbors and municipal leaders were also invited to participate in the discussion.

Based on past feedback from student and faculty leaders, the Working Group prioritized a series of public meetings. These included several large forums as well as a set of discussion “coffees” where people could ask questions of Interim Police Chief Carolyn McDermid and members of UOPD staff. In addition, electronic information and opportunities to ask questions and provide feedback were also provided.

The approach to offer many opportunities for broad engagement during winter term was intentional to provide focus on the topic and encourage as many individuals to join the conversation as possible in the middle of the academic year when the majority of campus stakeholders are at the institution daily. The Working Group was attentive to the wishes of the State Board for campus-wide efforts and used several online, print and in-person opportunities to spread the word about the invitations to participate.

The group acknowledges the inherent difficulty in reaching a community of nearly 30,000 students, faculty and staff comprehensively. However, the multiple formats of the events and opportunities to participate were as wide-reaching as possible including e-mails, advertisements, announcements at several organization meetings and web presence to spread the word and encourage attendance and engagement.
Campus and Community Outreach

The Campus Working Group scheduled three campus-wide forums, five smaller group meetings called “Coffee with the Chief,” established an e-mail address to receive known or anonymous comments and questions and wrote a series of stories on the university’s news information web page to provide opportunities for campus involvement.

Public forums were scheduled to accommodate the various class and work schedules and on-campus commitments of campus community members. Forums were scheduled for three days of the week (Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday) and at three different times (evening, late afternoon and mid-day). Venues were selected for appropriate size and in locations to the east, center and west portions of campus.

Attendance at the public forums grew with each successive meeting. Students, faculty, staff and community members who joined the meetings were engaged in the topic, asked many questions and voiced opinions directly to UOPD and university leaders.

In addition, the “Coffees with the Chief” were scheduled on Tuesday (twice), Wednesday, Thursday and Friday; at mid-day and afternoon times.

As expected, the coffee events were attended by fewer campus individuals than the forums. For students, faculty and staff who may feel uncomfortable speaking in front of a larger audience, this format was intentionally more personal to provide a platform for free expression.

A dedicated webpage about campus policing was created within Around the O, the university’s primary news and information resource, to serve as a hub for information about the campus discussion. Six stories were created and posted at http://around.uoregon.edu/campus-policing to inform students, faculty, staff and community members about:

1) Opportunities to participate in the discussion about the possibility of police arming;
2) Background information about the legislative and state board processes to date;
3) Transition from UO public safety department to UO police department;
4) Collaborative approach with campus partners;
5) Additional police services enabled by firearms;
6) Hiring and training processes for police officers;
7) Q and A with Interim Chief Carolyn McDermed

Around the O also published four blog entries about the campus forums and informal coffee events to serve as invitations and reminders to encourage participation.

All UO employees and students with university e-mail addresses (approximately 29,000 individuals) were sent notification e-mails on February 5 and February 25 regarding the campus discussion and opportunities to participate. The message contained a summary of the issue of possible campus police arming, a link to more information on the subject, and a description of the input process.
Near-campus neighborhood leaders who regularly receive communications from the UO Office of Government and Community Relations received e-mails about the forums in early February. In addition, members of the City of Eugene Police Commission, a policy advisory body, were informed of the outreach process.

Information on the meetings, on campus policing, on the feedback submission process, and links to the web hub, have been posted on the UOPD web site since early February (police.uoregon.edu). The department has also regularly sent out meeting reminders through its Facebook (facebook.com/uopolicie) and Twitter (@UOPolicie) accounts.

The campus forums and the link for further information were advertised in the independent student newspaper, the Oregon Daily Emerald, with advertisements on February 7, February 11 and February 25.

Media

UOPD and the Office of Strategic Communications communicated regularly with local print and broadcast media to encourage coverage of the campus discussion and to clarify information throughout the process.

*The Register-Guard* newspaper (Eugene) and the student newspaper, *Oregon Daily Emerald*, both published cover stories in advance of the first large public forum. *The Register-Guard* article appeared on Sunday, February 10 and the *Daily Emerald* story ran on Monday, February 4. Local TV stations had several stories during the engagement period that discussed the issue and mentioned upcoming public meetings. KLCC radio ran an extensive feature on the topic on March 4, in advance of the final two public meetings.

Conclusion

The Campus Working Group is in agreement that a campus-wide conversation was thorough and the group made a significant effort to reach as many students, faculty and staff as possible to be included in this conversation. It was clearly articulated that a number of factors will help inform the decision of whether or not to make a recommendation to the State Board of Higher Education to arm UOPD officers. Informed public input is an important part of the consideration.

The members of the working group are available to answer questions or provide further information if requested by university leaders.
APPENDIX A: List of Engagement Activities, by Category

Students

Black Student Union; April 4, 2012
Nick McCain, ASUO Vice President; July 25, 2012
Laura Hinman, ASUO President; July 12, 2012
Lindy Mabuye, ASUO Senator (Seat 3); September 28, 2012
ASUO Senate; October 3, 2012
Olivia Manwarren, BSU Co-Director; October 24, 2012
Individual student; October 25, 2012
Individual student; October 26, 2012
Individual student (writing for Oregon Commentator); October 30, 2012
Individual student; November 2, 2012
EMU Multicultural Center Board; November 2, 2012
Nick McCain, ASUO Vice President & staff member; November 8, 2012
Black Student Union; November 14, 2012
Patrick Glang, Residence Hall Association President; November 21, 2012
ASUO Safe Ride; January 15, 2013
Individual student; January 15, 2013
Individual student; January 17, 2013
Individual student; January 17, 2013
Individual student; January 22, 2013
Individual student (resident assistant); January 25, 2013
Residence Hall Association; January 28, 2013
Matthew Miyamoto, ASUO Senate President (Seat 7); January 29, 2013
Taylor Allison, ASUO Senator (Seat 2); January 29, 2013
Ashley Cranston, applicant for ASUO Senate (Seat 9); January 30, 2013
Jeremy Hedlund, ASUO Senate Vice President (Seat 6); January 30, 2013
Lamar Wise, ASUO Senator (Seat 10); January 30, 2013
Kaitlyn Chock, ASUO Senator (Seat 11); January 31, 2013
Will Steiner, ASUO Senator (Seat 15); January 31, 2013
Beau Acoba, ASUO Senator (Seat 1); January 31, 2013
Individual student; February 5, 2013
ASUO Executive; February 7, 2013
Ben Rudin, ASUO Senator (Seat 19); February 11, 2013
Chase Salazar, ASUO Senator (Seat 17); February 11, 2013
Liliana Villanueva, ASUO Multicultural Advocate; February 11, 2013
Lindy Mabuye, ASUO Senator (Seat 3); February 11, 2013
Liliana Villanueva, ASUO Multicultural Advocate; February 13, 2013
ASUO Senate (presentation); February 13, 2013
Individual student; February 14, 2013
Individual student; February 20, 2013
Individual student; March 1, 2013
Carla Villanueva, UO Women's Center; March 7, 2013

Employee Representative Groups and Individuals

Robert Kyr, UO Senate President; November 5, 2012
University Senate (initial question solicitation); November 7, 2012
SEIU Leadership; January 22, 2013
SEIU Chapter Meeting; February 13, 2013
University Senate (presentation); February 13, 2013
Patrick Chinn, Officers of Administration Council; March 11, 2013
Graduate Teaching Fellow Federation Executive Council; March 11, 2013
Miriam Bolton, Officers of Administration Council; March 12, 2013

Campus Representative Groups and Individuals or Events

Policing Implementation Advisory Group; May 4, 2012
Policing Implementation Advisory Group; May 29, 2012
Policing Implementation Advisory Group; June 27, 2012
Robin Holmes, VP Student Affairs; July 25, 2012
Policing Implementation Advisory Group; August 1, 2012
Policing Implementation Advisory Group; August 29, 2012
Policing Implementation Advisory Group; September 27, 2012
Shelly Kerr, Counseling and Testing Center Director; October 24, 2012
Policing Implementation Advisory Group; November 1, 2012
Policing Implementation Advisory Group; November 29, 2012
Robert Thallon, Associate Dean for Administration, Architecture & Allied Arts; December 19, 2012
Policing Implementation Advisory Group; January 9, 2013
UO Family Housing Board; February 7, 2013
Policing Implementation Advisory Group; February 22, 2013
UO Parent and Family Association "Mallard Mingle"; February 23, 2013
Policing Implementation Advisory Group; March 8, 2013

Campus-Wide Public Meetings

Campus Forum, Global Scholars Hall; February 11, 2013
Coffee with the Chief, EMU Walnut Room; February 19, 2013
Coffee with the Chief, EMU Board Room; February 21, 2013
Campus Forum, EMU Fir Room; February 26, 2013
Coffee with the Chief, EMU Walnut Room; February 27, 2013
Coffee with the Chief, Moore Dining Room, Bean Complex; March 1, 2013
Coffee with the Chief, EMU Walnut Room; March 5, 2013
Campus Forum, Knight Library Browsing Room; March 6, 2013
APPENDIX B: Feedback Gathered

An e-mail account, campuspolicing@uoregon.edu, was established to collect electronic comments and questions related to the on-campus discussion about the possibility of arming UO police officers. In total, 56 members of the UO and Eugene/Springfield area communities communicated via the e-mail address. Some commenters indicated that they were unable to attend one of the campus forums or informal coffee sessions and choose to submit their input via this delivery mechanism. Others sent comments to reiterate questions or comments provided in person at the events.

Tally of comments received by e-mail:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>In Favor</th>
<th>Opposed</th>
<th>No Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment cards were also circulated at the campus forums and coffee meetings. There were 17 comment cards returned with approximately two-thirds of the respondents who stated a position opposed to arming UO police officers.

Those in support of arming UO police officers cited high-profile campus and school shootings as worst-case scenarios when expedited response time can save lives, as well as the role police officers serve to protect campus.

Commenters opposed to arming UO police officers cited the ability to rely on Eugene Police Department for campus services, pride in being a weapons-free campus, relative safety on campus with little violent crime, concern about possible accidental shootings, and perceived increases in tuition costs if UO police officers are equipped with firearms.

Excerpts of comments submitted:

"I support arming the UO Police force. My primary reason is that if someone horrible happens on campus, we cannot wait for the Eugene Police department to respond. Having dedicated officers on campus is the best way to address any serious threats to the lives of my students and colleagues." – UO faculty

"I am 100% in favor of arming fully trained police officers. We need this kind of enforcement and/or perceived enforcement. I liked the comment I heard at one forum. ‘Even a holstered weapon has power’. " – UO staff member

"Shootings are always a possibility, as are other violent crimes. We can’t hope that nothing bad ever happens on campus... Please, for the sake of the students and faculty at UO, arm the UOPD. They should have to meet the same standards as any other police department."
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and go through the same training. If the UOPD remains unarmed, they cannot protect me and my student fees should NOT fund a security force that can’t provide security.” – UO undergraduate student

“The U of O campus is not immune to violence from students and non-students. Having an armed full service Police Department is the only logical choice. I speak from experience. I was assigned to the Eugene Police Campus Detail for three years during my 30 year law enforcement career. The closest call to having to shoot someone in those 30 years was defending an unarmed Campus Security Officer who was being attacked by a transient with a knife. Everybody went home (or to jail) that day because I had a gun and was able to stop the threat without firing. Without the gun, things would have been different.” – Eugene community member

“I would simply like to state that some of us see arming the officers as a good thing and I would be one those. It certainly puts them in a position to handle those rare situations where the use of a gun is necessary. If we had a campus shooting like the one at Virginia Tech, the response time would be swifter and that means lives would be saved, and isn’t that the best reason we could have.” – UO staff member

“The U of O Officers are trained in Police Academies and firing ranges. I am sure they do not want to use their weapon unless it is to protect themselves, victims or witnesses. They want to go home safely to their families and loved ones at the end of their shift. I believe officers with proper training will use discretion on the job. I applaud the job the U of O officers do.” – Eugene community member

“My preference would be not to deploy armed police, at least in reference to alcohol and testosterone fueled bad behavior in our neighborhood. My hope would be that the culture which so disrespects our neighborhood could be brought to respect an unarmed officer, and by extension to respect an unarmed neighborhood. In other situations, deploying armed officers might well be necessary.” – Eugene community member

“I have been having serious anxiety around this issue. I want you to know that I DO NOT CONSENT TO ARMING THE UOPD. And I have serious problems with this basically resting in the hands of our university president who is a privileged white male.” – UO undergraduate student

“I have never once felt unsafe on campus. I cannot recall any incident where I felt that the situation would have turned out better if only someone with a gun would have gotten there sooner... I understand that the UO police force cannot perform certain duties without having firearms, and I am very willing to accept that reality.” – UO graduate student

“The U of O PD has done a tremendous job thus far and has maintained a good relation to the students. The use of protection for the U of PD should be limited to non-lethal weapons to ensure safety for students and our U of O PD. Please for the safety of the students, faculty*, and police department withhold the implementation of firearms for the UO PD. There is a certain need for younger generations to taunt figures of authority and push them to their limits, it is irresponsible of us, yet has occurred numerous times throughout our history...Our university is a safe environment to learn and we respect our police department for keeping it this way.” – UO undergraduate student

“The uo already suffers enough inequality with athletes and administration flexing their
power and status across various domains— the police will have rights to guns first, with others soon to follow because why should the cops be the most powerful? They aren’t, they won’t be. Because allowing some guns will surely invite more guns.” — UO faculty

“Arming the campus police would be simply outrageous. The discussion centers on feeding the police state which is not at all in the spirit of our campus and is going counter to the current national trend, led by the President, of questioning the value of firearms in the hands of those who do not really need them. I hope you can collect input from community members and use this to input to ward off the NRA type reactionaries who think we need to be able to shoot folks to maintain an orderly society. Think compassion and think of Britain’s unarmed bobbies.” — UO emeritus faculty

“I would like to put my comments on the record stating that I am not in favor of the campus police force being allowed to carry guns. A few years back we had one of our graduate students maced in the face, thrown to the ground and basically beaten up by the campus police for trying to enter Willamette hall at 2 am. Graduate students frequently find it necessary to enter the buildings at all times of the night to tend to their experiments. I’m afraid to think what may have happened if the campus police were armed at that time. Their over reaction and intimidation of this graduate student was unacceptable. I can not think of any incident on campus that could have been better handled if the officer was armed.” — UO faculty

“Students voted against this in 2011 and their opinion was ignored.”

Some background for this comment, made several times during the campus discussion:

- On the spring 2011 ASUO election ballot, there was a referendum question titled “Should the Department of Public Safety remain a department without sworn police officers or access to weapons including guns and Tasers?”

- The vote count on this ballot measure was 3878 in favor, 1095 opposed. (The Daily Emerald reports results at http://dailyemerald.com/2011/04/01/full-2011-12-asuo-election-results/) Of the students who voted on that particular measure, 77.9 percent opposed a transition to a university police department with guns or Tasers.

- The 3878 who favored that measure made up about 17 percent of the enrolled student body at the time of the election.

- According to the UO Office of Institutional Research, of the 23,754 students enrolled for winter term 2013, 9559 of those were also enrolled in winter term 2011.

- The 2012–13 ASUO chose not to place a similar referendum on the 2013 ballot.
UOPD Credentials and Readiness

Prepared by University of Oregon Police Department Interim Chief Carolyn McDermot, spring 2013, for consideration by the University of Oregon executive leadership team and President Michael Gottfredson

State of Oregon Police Agency Recognition

Following the 2011 passage of Senate Bill 405, and subsequent approval by the State Board of Higher Education, the University of Oregon was allowed to officially transition its Department of Public Safety to a sworn police agency. The Oregon Department of Public Safety Standards and Training (DPSST) recognized the UO Department of Public Safety (later UO Police Department) as a state law enforcement agency, receiving at no cost agency-placed officer candidates to the Basic Police Academy. The university department commissioned its first officers in January 2012, and sent its first officers to the academy in February.

Command Staff Qualifications

Interim Chief Carolyn McDermot has been a sworn police officer for 30 years, with eight years as a line officer and field training officer in the San Diego Police Department, 17 years as an officer and commander with the Eugene Police Department, and five years as assistant chief and interim chief with the University of Oregon Police Department.

Police Captain Pete Deshpande has been a sworn police officer for more than 23 years, including 22 as an officer and commander with the Eugene Police Department. Captain Deshpande also holds undergraduate and graduate degrees from the University of Oregon.

Police Standards and Training Lieutenant Mike Morrow has more than 32 years law enforcement experience at the federal, county, municipal, military and university levels. Before joining the UO, he retired from the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) after 20 years service, including resident-in-charge of the Eugene and Salem resident agencies of the Portland field office, among other leadership assignments.

Communications and Emergency Response Center (CERC)

UOPD Communications Officers (commonly known as dispatchers) attend state-certified DPSST training as well as department training. UOPD is officially recognized by the state with an Originating Agency Identifier (ORI) of OR0201300.

UOPD accesses the same county-wide data system as other Lane County law enforcement agencies, known as the Area Information Records System, or AIRS. UOPD communications officers routinely query and enter information into this system the same as other area law enforcement agencies in order to share information.

UOPD CERC works closely with Central Lane Communications Center (9-1-1) to view and access the calls for service other to area law enforcement agencies. UOPD also belongs to the Lane Regional Interoperable Radio Group (LRIG), and works closely with other city and county agencies to promote radio interoperability between local law enforcement agencies.
Policy Status

UOPD department operational policy is built on a foundation from Lexipol, a national service that analyzes and suggests law enforcement policies by evaluating federal and state laws as well as industry best practices. UOPD then modifies its policies based on department and campus needs. Policies are reviewed and approved by UO general counsel.

Clergy Compliance

University of Oregon Police Department policy and practices fully comply with the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act. UOPD encourages accurate and prompt reporting of all crimes and takes all such reports seriously (20 USC § 1092 ((1)(C)(iii)). Reports will be accepted in any manner, including in person or in writing, at any Department facility. Reports producing Clery statistics will be accepted anonymously, by phone or via e-mail or on the institution’s website. Compliance with the Clery Act is accomplished through a joint effort between UOPD, other university departments, university employees and student groups, and other local law enforcement.

Officer Training & Compliance with DPSST

All UOPD sworn police officers complete certification requirements per the Oregon Department of Public Safety Standards and Training, as must all certified police in the state. For new officers, this includes the successful completion of the DPSST Basic Police Academy, a 16-week, full-time course in application of state law, police practices, field judgment, physical fitness and agility, appropriate use of force and officer tools.

After completion of the academy, UOPD police officers must then complete another 16 weeks of field training, to apply policing skills in the real world, under the supervision of an experienced officer.

Police officers train regularly and qualify annually in the appropriate and accurate use of firearms. All department patrol officers receive ongoing training for application of state and local laws, defensive tactics and use of force, field judgment, community policing standards, and multicultural competency. They also receive first aid, CPR and automated external defibrillator training. All UOPD public safety officers (non-sworn personnel) have successfully completed police reserve academy training (roughly 320 hours) or equivalent.

Professional Agency Affiliations

The University of Oregon Police Department and its key leaders are active members in the following professional associations, to keep abreast of industry best practices and to network and problem-solve effectively with peers from across the country:

- International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators (IACLEA)
- International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP)
- Western Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators (WACLEA)
- Oregon Association of Chiefs of Police (OACP)
- Oregon Peace Officers Association (OPOA)
- Oregon State Sheriffs Association (OSSA)
• Association of Threat Assessment Professionals (ATAP)
• Northwestern University Center for Public Safety (NUCPS)
• Lexipol

Readiness to Arm

If ultimately the university is granted authority to arm its sworn police officers, existing police supervisors would be ready and able to arm immediately, and to begin expanding police services to campus. The resources and equipment needed to arm police officers are in place currently.

The university’s 11 sworn police officers, all supervisors of the rank sergeant and above, have each completed required state certification and training that apply to all police officers in the state. Their training includes certification and expertise in the use of service weapons, as well as field judgment and discretion in any use of force.

All future police line officers serving the university will be sworn and properly certified, including completion of the state’s basic police academy (if the hired officer is not already certified in the state). Thus, all future university officers will be fully trained and certified in the use of firearms when they begin their service to the department.

Deployment of Enhanced Services

Arrestee transport can begin immediately, performed initially by the on-duty police supervisors. Eventually, police line officers will perform this duty.

Response to domestic disputes and armed or dangerous individuals, performed by on-duty police supervisors, can begin immediately. Because of the limited number of UOPD police officers on each shift, Eugene Police support would still be requested as necessary depending on the situation.

Traffic enforcement can begin as soon as department police supervisors receive training on agency standards for conducting traffic stops. However, as this would be a new service to campus, the rollout of any traffic enforcement would be carefully planned, and advanced by a marketing and communications campaign to prepare the campus community for how traffic laws would be enforced, and expectations for traffic stops.

Off-campus investigations or partner agency mutual aid would not begin until university leadership would authorize UOPD to conduct business off of university-owned and -controlled property. Investigations into cases that originate with other agencies like Eugene Police would need case-by-case approval for assistance by the originating agency.

Off-campus enforcement would not begin until university leadership would authorize UOPD to conduct business beyond university-owned and -controlled property. Also, the university and UOPD would need to discuss and agree on a memorandum of understanding or interagency agreement about how UOPD and EPD would work together in off-campus areas. Finally, UOPD would need to have sufficient capacity (officer resources) to effectively and safely carry out enforcement per the prospective MOU.
June 3, 2013

Michael R. Gottfredson  
President, University of Oregon  
Office of the President  
1226 University of Oregon  
Eugene, OR 97403-1226

Re: Arming University of Oregon Police Officers

Dear President Gottfredson:

I am writing to support the arming of University of Oregon police officers.

As you know, I testified in support SB 405. My experience investigating officer-involved shootings has repeatedly confirmed my belief in the necessity of properly training and equipping police officers. My support for arming your police department is based upon the following:

- Police officers are most effective, most efficient and most welcome in the communities in which they serve when they are fully adapted and trained to serve the unique needs of their community.

- Although the university community is unique, it is part of a larger community facing substantial threats to our public safety. These threats routinely penetrate campus boundaries, so the law enforcement response to them should be fully integrated and seamless.

- Anybody serving in a police role should be fully trained and equipped to meet all foreseeable challenges.

- It is dangerous, for officer and citizen alike, when public safety personnel look like police officers but cannot function like them.

- Law enforcement partners are most effective when they are equally capable and equally dependent upon one another. University public safety officers will not be fully functional and fully integrated with our law enforcement community until they are properly equipped and otherwise fully prepared to respond and partner as “back-up” to other agencies. They cannot function as equals until they are perceived as equals, and that won’t happen as long as they are required to retreat in the face of armed threats.

- Many would-be assailants will be discouraged by an armed police presence.

- Most violent encounters erupt, unfold and resolve very quickly, often in a matter of just a few moments. An officer who must “return to base” in order to properly arm is at risk and almost useless in most violent encounters.
Our area is substantially under-policed by national standards. It would be helpful if Eugene Police officers could remain on active patrol instead of diverting to transport offenders arrested by university police officers (because unarmed officers can’t transport offenders to jail).

Thank you for taking the time to read this letter. Please don’t hesitate to call if you have questions. I’m delighted to help in any way I can.

Sincerely,

Alex Gardner
Lane County District Attorney

p.s. I have enclosed a copy of “Hollywood Verses Reality, Officer Involved Shootings”, a short collaborative production of our local law enforcement team. We developed this video to comply with the requirement of Oregon SB-111 and help citizens understand violent police encounters. It has been very well received throughout the United States. It has been exported, by request, to at least six foreign countries, including Belgium, France, Australia, Germany, Canada, and South Africa.
May 7, 2013

Michael R. Gottfredson  
President, University of Oregon  
Office of the President  
1226 University of Oregon  
Eugene, OR 97403-1226

Re: Oregon Association Chiefs of Police Support for Arming  
University of Oregon Police Officers

Dear President Gottfredson,

On behalf of the over 300 members of the Oregon Association Chiefs of Police, please accept this letter of support for arming your University of Oregon police officers like all other certified police officers in Oregon. During the legislative deliberations that led to passage of SB 405, the OACP was proud to join the University of Oregon in support of the measure. At the time, we were clear that arming police officers, regardless of the policing context, is critically important to the safety of students, faculty, community members, visitors and the police officers that risk their lives to serve and protect. We believe strongly that:

- All certified police officers should be equipped with the full range of tactical weapons and protective gear in keeping with their training in order to respond effectively to a wide range of circumstances.

- Armed officers are able to take full advantage of their training and to more safely perform a full range of law enforcement services for their communities.

- Police agencies and police leaders must provide officers, who put themselves in harm's way, with the equipment necessary to keep them as safe as possible.

- Officers who are unable to adequately respond to a dangerous circumstance because they are unarmed are at greater risk and are a liability to those they seek to protect. In a violent confrontation, where an unarmed officer must call for assistance from another police agency, the delayed response could easily result in escalation, injury and even death.
We believe that police officers at the University of Oregon can be armed properly and still operate within the university environment in a manner that fits the unique culture of the institution. We appreciate your willingness to consider our perspective on this important decision. For the safety of your officers and all those who consider the university their workplace and home, we urge you to arm your police officers.

Best Regards,

[Signatures]

Chief Ron Noble President
McMinnville Police Department

Chief Rock Rakosi, 2nd Vice President
Myrtle Point Police Department

Chief Scott Russell, 1st Vice President
Woodburn Police Department

Chief Geoff Spalding, Secretary/Treasurer
Beaverton Police Department

Chief Ken Johnson, Immediate Past President
Fairview Police Department
May 21, 2013

Michael R. Gottfredson
President, University of Oregon
Office of the President
1226 University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon 97403-1226

Re: Eugene Police Department Support for Arming University of Oregon Police Officers

Dear President Gottfredson,

As the University of Oregon transitions from a Department of Public Safety to a University Police Department, I believe it is important for you to know that I support the arming of the University of Oregon police officers.

Armed police officers can safely:
- Serve as first responders to in-progress acts of violence or possible violent incidents, including those involving an active shooter, domestic violence, robberies, many assaults, hold-up alarms, and workplace violence;
- Act as backup to a police officer from an adjacent department as mutual aid;
- Conduct traffic stops;
- Search, arrest and transport offenders.

Police officers in Eugene and within the American law enforcement profession are armed so that they can effectively protect the communities they serve, and can defend themselves from serious assault. Police are armed here because the offender population includes armed and dangerous individuals and people with severe and unpredictable mental health conditions. Officers are trained at our State academy to carry firearm as one of the tools accessible to them as they assess and address situations in the field. Removing that tool would either limit what they can or should do, or cause them to perform dangerous work in unsafe conditions.

I wish you the very best as you sort through the interesting question of equipping police officers in a newly established department. Please know that you can call on me and our department to assist in any way with the establishment of UOPD.

Sincerely,

Pete Kerns
Chief of Police
June 7th, 2013

Michael R. Gottfredson
President, University of Oregon
Office of the President
1226 University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403-1226

Dear President Gottfredson,

On behalf of the Springfield Police Department, I would offer support for arming your University of Oregon Police officers. On a professional level I know several of the command officers at your Police Department and have the upmost confidence in their ability lead to, train and supervise a fully equipped/armed police agency. I recognize that the policing of a university environment presents challenges not typically faced by standard police agencies. I am certain that your command officers understand this difference and can modify the training and goals to align with the University’s mission.

Certified police officers require numerous tools to safely complete their tasks and carry out the expectations of the community. Without firearms, your officers are limited in their ability to provide police service. They cannot effectively respond to emergency situations, delaying much needed help to potential victims.

As a neighboring agency who may be called upon to assist your officers, I am confident that mutual aid agreements can be worked out between the two departments. The addition of 11 fully functioning police officers within the metropolitan area only enhances the ability to react to catastrophic incidents or manage large special events. We would be pleased to share training resources where applicable if requested.

If you have any questions please do not hesitate to call.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Richard Lewis
Chief of Police
Springfield Police Department
June 10, 2013

Oregon State Board of Higher Education
Office of the Chancellor
PO Box 751
Portland, OR 97207-0751

Members of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education:

The Oregon Department of Public Safety Standards and Training (DPSST) has worked for more than a decade with the various public safety and security programs within the Oregon University System. Through our cooperative efforts, DPSST offered a five-week class to campus public safety officers. In 2008, DPSST actively worked with the Governor’s Campus Public Safety Task Force to discuss options that might be available to colleges and universities looking to improve and increase the safety and security services provided to their staff, students, and guests. During these meetings, it was very apparent that there was an interest by some universities to create a law enforcement agency/policy department.

DPSST worked with both the Oregon University System (OUS) and the University of Oregon to draft language that would allow an OUS member university to establish a police department with approval of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education (Board). A number of productive meetings were held with both groups which resulted in the introduction of Senate Bill 405 during the 2011 Legislative Session. DPSST, the Oregon Association of Chiefs of Police, and the Oregon State Sheriff’s Association were all actively involved in the hearings held on SB 405.

With the passage of SB 405, OUS was able to authorize its member universities interested in pursuing the creation of a police department to do so in partnership with DPSST. Police officers employed by an established university police department must meet DPSST employment, training, and certification standards. The Board gave the University of Oregon authorization to establish a police department at its October 2011 meeting.

DPSST has worked with the leadership of both the University of Oregon and the University of Oregon Police Department before, during, and after the passage of SB 405. The University presented a very deliberate and measured plan through which they would establish a professional law enforcement agency over a number of years. The blended plan includes hiring new officers.
who would attend DPSST’s 16-week Basic Police Class as well as hiring lateral officers from other agencies that would give the new police department seasoned police officers to act as patrol officers, field training officers, and command staff.

The University of Oregon Police Department meets all standards established for the Oregon law enforcement community by the DPSST.

We appreciate the time and assistance of both OUS and the University of Oregon as we worked to establish a process through which OUS member universities could establish police departments. To date, no other OUS member has approached DPSST with an interest in establishing a police department.

If we can be of any assistance, or provide any additional information, please feel free to contact me at (503) 378-2332.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Eriks J. Gabliks
Director
Dear President Gottfredson,

I hope this message finds you well. I would like to take the opportunity to discuss my perspective on arming the University of Oregon Police Department.

This year I served on numerous committees including but not limited to: Neighborhood Livability Working Group, Campus Partners, Good Neighbors, UOPD Policing Implementation Advisory Group, UOPD Oversight Working Group, UOPD Police Chief hiring committee, and many others. As a result, I am cognizant of the important role of UOPD in serving the many populations (faculty, staff, and students) that define the UO as their community. Specifically in regards to arming, this is a crucial component of a police department that may effectively serve and protect the student body.

As you may know, I am a double major in Economics and Planning, Public Policy and Management (PPPM). Often in my PPPM courses, we discuss the inner workings and policies of the City of Eugene. Through these conversations, I have been made aware of the budget issues facing the city and Eugene Police Department. In this context, it is hard for me to ignore the poor response time of Eugene police officers, especially in regards to the UO campus and the near campus neighborhoods. Additionally, there is a general feeling amongst the student body that EPD’s intentions are to enforce and fine rather than protect and prevent crime; this feeling has only been exacerbated by the recent ordinance on unruly gatherings. Additionally, as conversations continue of the potential of UOPD officers serving nearby, student-dense neighborhoods, it is important to recognize that this may only occur if the officers are properly equipped.

In my opinion, any opposition has been the result of either misinformation or long-held personal biases against police. As you may have mentioned before, armed University Police Departments are the norm, if not best practice, across the nation. Of all the universities in the US with more than 15,000 students, we are one of two schools that do not have an armed police department.

Let’s continue to more the University of Oregon forward so that we may better serve the needs of our faculty, staff, and students. It is with much consideration that I recommend your approval in arming the University of Oregon Police Department.

Sincerely,

Nick McCain
June 12, 2013

Dear Ms. Stuart,

The Executive Board of the South University Neighbors Association supports the University of Oregon in its effort to arm the University of Oregon Police Department (UOPD).

The South University Neighbors Association is a neighborhood group established by the City of Eugene. We represent the neighborhood immediately south of the University. Many crimes that affect students, faculty and staff on campus also spill over into the neighborhoods off campus. It has long been our hope that the University would become more involved in the policing of the neighborhoods where so many students live.

Our city police force (Eugene Police Department (EPD)) has limited resources and cannot always respond to incidents affecting livability in near-campus neighborhoods. We neighbors realize that we would benefit from having additional law enforcement resources. In order to do this the University of Oregon Police Department needs the ability to investigate the crimes both on and off campus. In order for UOPD to work with the Eugene police on such matters, they must have the same tools as EPD officers, including firearms. EPD will only enter into agreements to collaborate, if UOPD officers are armed and have the similar equipment and authorities.

A member of our executive board has also served on the UO Police Implementation Committee and can testify to the thoughtful deliberation that has gone into every aspect of this policy.

We hope that you will give this request your favorable consideration.

Yours respectfully,

Malcolm Wilson

on behalf of the SUNA executive board

We're writing to express our support for the proposal to arm UO police officers – provided they're going to start responding to near-campus incidents involving students.

With the explosion in students living off campus, we've seen a huge increase in problems with crime, noise violations and nuisances such as public drunkenness in our neighborhood. This weekend, there was an out-of-control party next door to our home involving more than 20 students. We called the police to starting at 8:55 p.m. to report the noise and behavior, but they were never able to respond.

The University of Oregon should have the responsibility to both protect and address the behavior of their own students – both on and off campus. To do that, they need the same resources as the city police – including carrying weapons.

Thank you for your time.
University District Business Association  
1401 Willamette St.  
Eugene, Or. 97401  

31 May, 2013  

State Board of Higher Education  

Dear Ms. Stuart,  

I am writing on behalf of the University District Business Association to offer our support of the arming of the UO Police Department.  

The main focus of the UDBA is to address safety issues along E. 13th Ave. leading to the University of Oregon. In the past we were forced to deal with aggressive transients and panhandlers, often with dogs, in front of our buildings asking patrons for money. It was not uncommon to have people passed out or asleep in front of businesses. There was trash and feces littering the sidewalks. In fact, it was so bad, customers would actually call to ask if it was safe to come to our stores. As a result of the partnership between the UDBA, the City of Eugene and the University of Oregon there now is a dedicated foot patrol officer for the district. I share this history because our area, the corridor to the west entrance of the University of Oregon, has seen first-hand what a difference a full service police presence makes to contributing to a vibrant, welcoming and most importantly, safe environment.  

By arming the UOPD we would feel an increased level of safety in our community because UOPD officers would be able to perform routine traffic stops, transport suspects to jail, and respond to domestic violence disputes. If armed, they would also be able to respond immediately to situations of greater threat such as an active shooter on campus instead of having to wait for the Eugene Police Department to arrive.  

All certified police officers are trained that a firearm is to be used only as a weapon of last resort. The UO has been allowed to create a police department with fully sworn and certified officers. We should arm the officers, as is standard in the state of Oregon, and allow them to offer full police services to protect the faculty, staff, students and visitors of the University of Oregon.  

We do not ask or expect other emergency response professionals to serve and protect without the proper safety equipment to do so; It should be no different for the officers of the UOPD.  

Sincerely,
Neva P Becker
President, University District Business Association
General Manager, Rainbow Optics