

From: OREGONDAS Support <oregondas@govqa.us>
To: "oregon.gov@rswfire.email" <oregon.gov@rswfire.email>
Date: Monday, July 06, 2026 10:57 PM UTC
Subject: [Records Center] Public Records Request :: R000879-070126

--- Please respond above this line ---

RE: Public Records Request of July 01, 2026, Reference # R000879-070126 Dear Robert Samuel White, In accordance with ORS 192.324(2), this acknowledges our receipt of your July 01, 2026, public records request. Your request included the following: "Any and all records — including emails, memoranda, letters, text messages, meeting notes, advisory opinions, complaint records, investigation materials, and internal communications — created, sent, received, or maintained by your agency that mention, reference, or otherwise concern Robert Samuel White (also appearing as "rswfire" or "Robert White" or "Samuel White"), including but not limited to: Any record referencing my volunteer service with, or expulsion from, the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department, or any communication I sent to state officials regarding that matter; Any record concerning the conduct of Oregon Parks and Recreation Department employees or officials in relation to me, including any assessment, advice, or communication regarding how my case or complaints were handled; Any record in which I am named or identifiably described in connection with personnel, human resources, legal, risk, or accountability matters; Any communication between your agency and the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department, the Office of the Governor, or any other state entity that references me. Time period: January 1, 2024 to the present." The Oregon Department of Administrative Services is not the custodian of the requested records. Please submit your request with Oregon Parks and Recreation Department, the custodian of responsive agency personnel records: Submit a Public Records Request . For questions or additional information, please reply to this email. This request is now closed. Thank you, Bryanna Duke Oregon Department of Administrative Services

To monitor the progress or update this request please log into the Public Records Center

From: Robert Samuel White <rsw@rswfire.com>
To: "bryanna.duke@das.oregon.gov" <bryanna.duke@das.oregon.gov>
Cc: "governor.kotek@oregon.gov" <governor.kotek@oregon.gov>, "marissa@tinafororegon.com" <marissa@tinafororegon.com>
Date: Monday, July 06, 2026 7:03 PM UTC-07:00
Subject: Request R000879-070126 — Reopening and Proper Disposition

Dear Ms. Duke,

Thank you for your response to Public Records Request R000879-070126. I'm writing to address the disposition and to ask that the request be reopened, as the closure does not resolve what I actually asked for.

The request was closed on the basis that the Oregon Department of Administrative Services "is not the custodian" of the responsive records, with a referral to the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department.

I did not request OPRD's records. I requested the Department's own records, and the referral does not respond to that request.

My request expressly sought the Department's own communications: correspondence between DAS and OPRD, and between DAS and the Office of the Governor, that reference me. DAS is necessarily the custodian of its own communications. OPRD cannot

produce records that DAS created, sent, received, or maintains, and a referral to OPRD therefore cannot serve as a lawful response to my request. For these records, DAS is the only possible custodian.

I recognize that a "not the custodian" determination and a "no responsive records" determination are distinct under Oregon law, and I'm not conflating them. If the Department's position is that it holds no responsive records of its own,

I would ask that it say so expressly, as that is a different representation, with different consequences, than a referral to another agency.

Accordingly, I respectfully ask that R000879-070126 be reopened and that the Department provide, for the period January 1, 2024 through the present, one of the following as to DAS's own records:

Production of the responsive records; Production with any claimed exemptions identified on a record-by-record basis, with the specific statutory authority for each; or A written statement that the Department holds no responsive records within these categories.

For the avoidance of any doubt as to scope, the request includes any DAS record that references me in connection with a notice of claim under 42 U.S.C. 1983 served on an OPRD official, and any DAS communication with the Office of the

Governor that references me. Given that notice, I think we can both anticipate that responsive records within the Department's custody exist, and I would prefer to proceed on that shared understanding rather than through avoidable procedural steps.

I would also ask, as a matter of convenience, that we conduct this correspondence by email. I found the online

portal cumbersome, and direct email will allow both of us to keep a clear and complete record of our exchange.

Please feel free

to reply to me at this address.

I appreciate your time and the work your office does in administering these requests. I'm confident we can resolve this at your level without the need to escalate to the Attorney General under ORS 192.415, and I would much rather do that.

I'll look forward to your response.

Warm regards,

Robert Samuel White

Founder, Autonomy Realms

Owner, eNetwizard Inc.

Former Oregon State Parks Volunteer

Current U.S. Forest Service Caretaker

Steward, oprdvolunteerabuse.org

From: OREGONDAS Support <oregondas@govqa.us>
To: "oregon.gov@rswfire.email" <oregon.gov@rswfire.email>
Date: Tuesday, July 07, 2026 8:51 PM UTC
Subject: [Records Center] Public Records Request :: R000879-070126

--- Please respond above this line ---

RE: Public Records Request of July 01, 2026, Reference # R000879-070126 Hi Robert, Thank you for your follow up. I've reopened your request while we look into this further. I will provide an update as soon as possible. Sincerely, Bryanna Duke Oregon Department of Administrative Services

To monitor the progress or update this request please log into the Public Records Center

From: Robert Samuel White <rsw@rswfire.com>
To: "bryanna.duke@das.oregon.gov" <bryanna.duke@das.oregon.gov>
Cc: Governor Kotek * GOV <governor.kotek@oregon.gov>
Date: Tuesday, July 07, 2026 3:58 PM UTC-07:00
Subject: RE: Public Records Request R000879-070126 — Correspondence Channel and Preservation Notice

Dear Ms. Duke,

Thank you for reopening R000879-070126. I look forward to the Department's disposition.

I'm noting for the record that I have asked twice to conduct this correspondence by email, and that your responses have come only through the GovQA portal. I will continue to correspond by email, and I am copying both of my prior emails, and this one, into the portal so the full exchange is preserved in that system as well.

I want to be direct about why the channel matters. The portal does not retain basic formatting it strips line breaks and renders correspondence as an unstructured block which makes it an inadequate medium for a legal matter of this kind, where the precise wording, structure, and sequence of communications may become relevant. Email preserves the record faithfully and gives both of us a complete, verbatim account of what was said and when. For that reason I will treat email as the authoritative channel for this matter and mirror it into the portal for the Department's convenience, rather than the reverse.

Separately, I have not yet received acknowledgment of my second public records request, submitted regarding the Department's custodial-basis closures and any governing policy. Given the response to my first public records request, the second will be used to audit the process itself. Please confirm receipt of that request and provide the Department's response or an anticipated response date.

Finally, I want to make the preservation obligation explicit as to both matters.

Please treat this as formal notice of a duty to preserve all records potentially responsive to R000879-070126 and to my second request regarding custodial-basis closures and governing policy. This includes, without limitation, the requested communications themselves; all request logs, disposition data, and portal (GovQA) records reflecting how requests are received, categorized, closed, or referred; any written policy, guidance, training material, or decision criteria governing custodial-basis determinations; and all related internal communications.

Given my pending notice of claim under 42 U.S.C. 1983 and the reasonable anticipation of litigation, the Department is on notice that any deletion, alteration, overwriting, or failure to preserve potentially responsive records following receipt of this notice may constitute spoliation of evidence and may give rise to legal consequences, including sanctions and adverse-inference findings. This obligation extends to any automated retention, purging, or log-rotation

processes, which should be suspended as to potentially responsive records.

Thank you,

Robert Samuel White

Thank you,
Oregon Department of Administrative Services

To monitor the progress or update this request please log into the Public Records Center

From: Robert Samuel White <rsw@rswfire.com>
To: "bryanna.duke@das.oregon.gov" <bryanna.duke@das.oregon.gov>
Cc: "governor.kotek@oregon.gov" <governor.kotek@oregon.gov>
Date: Wednesday, July 08, 2026 3:31 PM UTC-07:00
Subject: R000879-070126 — Custodial Determination Under ORS 192.311(2)(b)

Dear Ms. Duke,

I am writing to document the statutory basis on which the closure of R000879-070126 was improper, and to place that analysis in the record alongside the Department's pending disposition.

The Department closed my request on the basis that it "is not the custodian" of the requested records, with a referral to the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department. That determination has a specific meaning under Oregon law, and the Department's use of it does not meet it.

ORS 192.311(2)(b) defines "custodian" as "[a] public body mandated, directly or indirectly, to create, maintain, care for or control a public record." The statute then provides a single exception: "Custodian" does not include a public body that has custody of a public record as an agent of another public body that is the custodian unless the public record is not otherwise available.

That exception is the only statutory route by which a public body in possession of a record may disclaim custody. It applies where the possessing body holds the record as an agent of the custodial body. It does not apply here.

My request sought the Department's own communications: correspondence between DAS and OPRD, and between DAS and the Office of the Governor, that reference me. In creating, sending, receiving, and maintaining its own correspondence, DAS acts as a principal on its own behalf, not as an agent holding another body's records. The agent exception in ORS 192.311(2)(b) is therefore unavailable, and DAS is the custodian of those records by the statute's plain definition.

The exception fails a second time as to the DAS Governor's office communications. Even where an agency relationship exists, ORS 192.311(2)(b) restores custodial status when the record "is not otherwise available." OPRD is not a party to correspondence between DAS and the Office of the Governor and cannot produce it. A referral to OPRD cannot make those records available, which places them squarely within the exception's own proviso.

The same analysis governs any OPRD-authored record in the Department's possession. ORS 192.329(2)(a) provides that a public body's response is complete when it provides access to or copies of all requested records "within the possession or custody of the public body" that it does not assert are exempt. The test is possession or custody, not authorship. A record prepared by OPRD and retained by DAS is a public record in DAS's possession and is responsive to a request directed to DAS.

I would also note that “not the custodian” is not an administrative convenience but a formal statutory representation. ORS 192.329(2)(d) provides that a response is complete only when the public body, “[t]o the extent that the public body is not the custodian of records that have been requested, provides a written statement to that effect.” The Department has made that representation as to records in its own possession, created in its own name, in its own systems. I ask the Department to identify the public body for which it claims to have been acting as agent, and the basis for that agency relationship, or to withdraw the determination.

Accordingly, the closure did not constitute a complete response under ORS 192.329(2). The lawful dispositions available to the Department remain those I identified in my letter requesting reopening:

1. Production of the responsive records;
2. Production with any claimed exemptions identified on a record-by-record basis, with the specific statutory authority for each; or
3. An express written statement that the Department holds no responsive records within these categories.

I would prefer to resolve this at your level. I am setting out this analysis now so that the record reflects it was available to the Department before any further disposition was made.

Thank you,

Robert Samuel White

Founder, Autonomy Realms

Owner, eNetwizard Inc.

Former Oregon State Parks Volunteer

Current U.S. Forest Service Caretaker

Steward, oprdvolunteerabuse.org

From: OREGONDAS Support <oregondas@govqa.us>
To: "oregon.gov@rswfire.email" <oregon.gov@rswfire.email>
Date: Wednesday, July 08, 2026 11:12 PM UTC
Subject: [Records Center] Public Records Request :: R000885-070726

--- Please respond above this line ---

RE: Public Records Request of July 07, 2026, Reference # R000885-070726 Dear Robert Samuel White, In accordance with ORS 192.324(2), this acknowledges our receipt of your July 07, 2026 public records request for: "The period January 1, 2022 to the present: 1. The number of public records requests the Department has closed, denied, or otherwise disposed of on the basis that DAS is not the custodian of the requested records (including dispositions referring the requester to another agency as custodian), broken down by year. 2. Any written policy, procedure, guidance, standard, or training material governing how and when the Department determines that it is not the custodian of requested records, and how such a determination is distinguished from a "no responsive records" determination. 3. Any record reflecting the standard applied in making custodial-basis dispositions — for example, checklists, decision templates, internal instructions, or correspondence establishing the criteria used." I am able to inform you that the Oregon Department of Administrative Services is reviewing the request to determine if there are responsive records. For questions or additional information, please reply to this email. Thank you, Bryanna Duke Oregon Department of Administrative Services

To monitor the progress or update this request please log into the Public Records Center

From: OREGONDAS Support <oregondas@govqa.us>
To: "oregon.gov@rswfire.email" <oregon.gov@rswfire.email>
Date: Friday, July 10, 2026 5:30 PM UTC
Subject: [Records Center] Public Records Request :: R000879-070126

--- Please respond above this line ---

RE: Public Records Request of July 01, 2026, Reference # R000879-070126 Dear Robert Samuel White, In response to your request for: "Any record in which I am named or identifiably described in connection with personnel, human resources, legal, risk, or accountability matters" The Oregon Department of Administrative Services (DAS) is able to inform you that they have reviewed their files and did not locate records. Therefore, this portion of this request is now closed. In response to your request for: "Any communication between your agency and the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department, the Office of the Governor, or any other state entity that references me." DAS is still reviewing their records and will notify you if there are records as soon as possible. For questions or additional information, please reply to this email. Sincerely, Bryanna Duke Oregon Department of Administrative Services

To monitor the progress or update this request please log into the Public Records Center

From: Robert Samuel White <rsw@rswfire.com>
To: "bryanna.duke@das.oregon.gov" <bryanna.duke@das.oregon.gov>
Cc: Governor Kotek * GOV <governor.kotek@oregon.gov>
Date: Friday, July 10, 2026 11:44 AM UTC-07:00
Subject: RE: R000879-070126 — Documentation of Search; Timeline for Remaining Portion

Dear Ms. Duke,

Thank you for the response of today's date on R000879-070126.

I want to address the two portions in turn.

The closed portion.

DAS states that it reviewed its files and did not locate records responsive to the request for any record in which I am named or identifiably described in connection with personnel, human resources, legal, risk, or accountability matters. I am not disputing that representation. I am asking DAS to document the search that produced it.

Under ORS 192.329, a public body's response is complete when it has conducted a reasonable search. A statement that no records were located is a statement about a search, and I am entitled to understand how it was conducted. Specifically, I ask DAS to identify:

1. The custodians and offices whose records were searched;
2. The systems and repositories queried, including email, and any personnel, legal, risk, or human resources files;
3. The date range applied;
4. The search terms or identifiers used.

I raise one point of scope directly, because it bears on the result. The request covers records in which I am *named or identifiably described.* A search keyed only to my name would not capture a record that describes me without naming me. Given that a portion of this request concerns exactly such records, I ask DAS to confirm whether the search accounted for identifiable description and not only my name.

The portion still under review.

DAS states it is still reviewing records responsive to the request for communications between DAS and the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department, the Office of the Governor, or any other state entity that reference me, and will notify me if there are records.

I ask that DAS provide the acknowledgment and completion timelines that ORS 192.324 requires, including the date by which DAS expects to complete this portion. If any responsive record is withheld in whole or part, I ask that each withholding be identified

on a record-by-record basis with the specific statutory exemption claimed, as the law requires. I am not requesting a narrative; I am requesting that the disposition, when it comes, take one of the forms the statute provides: production, production with itemized exemptions, or a written statement that no responsive records exist.

I appreciate your continued attention and will await the completion of the second portion.

Sincerely,

Robert Samuel White

Founder, Autonomy Realms

Owner, eNetwizard Inc.

Former Oregon State Parks Volunteer

Current U.S. Forest Service Caretaker

Steward, oprdvolunteerabuse.org

From: Robert Samuel White <rsw@rswfire.com>
To: "bryanna.duke@das.oregon.gov" <bryanna.duke@das.oregon.gov>
Cc: Governor Kotek * GOV <governor.kotek@oregon.gov>
Date: Sunday, July 12, 2026 12:24 AM UTC-07:00
Subject: R000879-070126

Dear Ms. Duke,

I am writing further regarding R000879-070126, and specifically the Department's determination that it "did not locate records" responsive to my request for any record in which I am named or identifiably described in connection with personnel, human resources, legal, risk, or accountability matters.

I am not, in this letter, asserting what any particular record contains. I am placing on the record the reasons that a determination of "no records" in this category is difficult to credit given what is already publicly documented about my matter, and asking the Department to reconcile the determination with those facts or to document the search that produced it.

Consider the nature and scope of the matter the Department was searching against.

My dismissal from the Oregon State Parks volunteer program, and the events surrounding it, are not an ordinary personnel or volunteer matter confined to a single park. They involve a written expulsion from every state park in Oregon that cites protected speech as its basis a First Amendment question on its face. They involve, by the agency's own subsequent conduct, correspondence from the Deputy Director drafted with the involvement of counsel, an assertion that I might file legal action, and a warning of referral to the Department of Justice. They involve three armed officers two Oregon State Police and one federal appearing on restricted federal land on the anniversary of my dismissal. They involve a matter I have documented publicly and in detail, and which I have raised, in writing, at every level of the executive branch.

Over the course of approximately a year, I directed correspondence concerning this matter to the Director of Oregon State Parks, to the Deputy Director, to the Office of the Governor, and to the Governor's campaign, among others. That correspondence names me, originates from me, and concerns the legal, risk, and accountability dimensions of my treatment. I raise this not because I sent it to the Department, but because a matter carrying this profile constitutional exposure, executive-branch correspondence, law-enforcement contact, and public documentation, sustained over a year is precisely the kind of matter that a central administrative services agency responsible for personnel, human resources, legal, and risk functions across the executive branch would ordinarily have some record of.

That is the discrepancy I ask the Department to address. The Department is the executive branch's principal body for personnel, human resources, risk, and related administrative functions. My matter is one with

documented personnel, legal, risk, and accountability dimensions, escalated across the executive branch over the course of a year. A determination that the Department holds no record not one in which I am named or identifiably described in connection with any of those matters is difficult to reconcile with the documented profile of the matter itself.

I ask the Department to do one of the following.

If, notwithstanding the above, the Department maintains that it holds no responsive records in this category, I ask it to document the search that produced that determination: the custodians and offices searched, the systems and repositories queried, the date range applied, and the search terms or identifiers used. A determination of "no records" is a statement about a search, and the facts above make the adequacy of that search a fair and material question.

Alternatively, if the Department has construed the scope of this portion narrowly for instance, by treating records that reference me as belonging solely to the separate portion of my request still under review I ask it to state that construction expressly and its basis. My request defines this category by content: records in which I am named or identifiably described in connection with the enumerated matters. That turns on what a record concerns, not on its author or channel. Under ORS 192.329(2)(a), the Department's obligation runs to records within its possession or custody, without regard to authorship.

I ask that the Department treat this as a request to revisit the closure of this portion in light of the discrepancy, and to respond by documenting the search or by identifying the scope construction it has applied.

I appreciate your attention and will await the Department's response.

Sincerely,

Robert Samuel White

Founder, Autonomy Realms

Owner, eNetwizard Inc.

Former Oregon State Parks Volunteer

Current U.S. Forest Service Caretaker

Steward, oprdvolunteerabuse.org

From: Robert Samuel White <rsw@rswfire.com>
To: "bryanna.duke@das.oregon.gov" <bryanna.duke@das.oregon.gov>
Cc: Governor Kotek * GOV <governor.kotek@oregon.gov>
Date: Friday, July 17, 2026 1:30 PM UTC-07:00
Subject: RE: R000879-070126 and R000885-070726 — outstanding determinations, and notice of intent to petition under ORS 192.415

Dear Ms. Duke,

I am writing regarding R000879-070126 and R000885-070726.

Over the past ten days I have asked the Department four direct questions. Each has a form the statute supplies. None has been answered.

On July 8, I set out the analysis under ORS 192.311(2)(b) showing that the agent exception is unavailable as to the Department's own correspondence DAS creates, sends, receives, and maintains its own email as a principal, not as an agent holding another body's records and unavailable as to DAS Governor's office communications on the exception's own "not otherwise available" proviso, since OPRD is not a party to them and cannot produce them. I asked the Department to identify the public body for which it claims to have been acting as agent, and the basis for that agency relationship, or to withdraw the determination. Nine days. Neither.

On July 10 and again on July 12, I asked the Department to document the search that produced its "no records" determination: custodians and offices searched, systems and repositories queried, date range, terms and identifiers, and whether the search accounted for identifiable description and not only my name. Seven days. Nothing.

On July 10, I asked for the completion date ORS 192.324 requires for the portion of R000879 still under review. Seven days. No date.

On July 8, the Department acknowledged R000885-070726 without the estimated completion date that ORS 192.324(2)(b) requires when a response will exceed ten business days of acknowledgment. That period expires July 22.

On July 7, I served notice of the duty to preserve as to both requests. Ten days. No acknowledgment that it was received or distributed.

Here is what that pattern is. "Not the custodian" is not an administrative convenience. Under ORS 192.329(2)(d) it is a formal written representation, and it is the only representation available to a body in possession of records that wishes to disclaim them.

When that representation is challenged on the statute and the Department neither defends it nor withdraws it, the determination is not being maintained. It is being left standing without support, in a posture where it continues to operate against me while

no one has to own it. The same is true of the "no records" finding: a determination about a search that the Department will not describe is a conclusion with nothing under it.

I am not asking the Department to characterize anything. I am asking it to answer for its own representations, in its own name, under a statute that requires exactly that.

So I am asking, plainly, for the following.

1. Identify the public body for which DAS claims to have acted as agent under ORS 192.311(2)(b), and the basis for that agency relationship or withdraw the custodial determination and dispose of the request in one of the three lawful forms: production, production with itemized exemptions cited record by record, or an express written statement that no responsive records exist.
2. Document the search underlying the "no records" determination: custodians and offices, systems and repositories, date range, terms and identifiers, and whether identifiable description was accounted for.
3. Provide the estimated completion date for the portion of R000879 still under review, and for R000885-070726.
4. Confirm receipt and distribution of the July 7 preservation notice, and state whether any potentially responsive record has been destroyed, purged, overwritten, or aged off a retention schedule since July 7, and if so, what and when.

I would prefer to resolve this with you. That preference is real and I have acted on it for three weeks. But it is not unlimited, and I want the path stated rather than implied.

If the Department does not respond substantively, I intend to petition the Attorney General under ORS 192.415 for an order requiring disclosure, and to raise both the custodial determination and the adequacy of the search in that petition. R000885 asks how the Department makes custodial-basis determinations and what standard governs them. A petition that reaches that question reaches it for every requester the determination has been used against, not only me. I would rather the Department answer it here.

I renew my request for a fee waiver on public interest grounds under ORS 192.324(5) as to both requests. I am not seeking these records for any commercial purpose.

Sincerely,

Robert Samuel White

Founder, Autonomy Realms

Owner, eNetwizard Inc.

Former Oregon State Parks Volunteer

Current U.S. Forest Service Caretaker

Steward, oprdivolunteerabuse.org

From: Robert Samuel White <rsw@rswfire.com>
To: "bryanna.duke@das.oregon.gov" <bryanna.duke@das.oregon.gov>
Cc: "DAS.MediaRelations@DAS.oregon.gov" <das.mediarelations@das.oregon.gov>, Governor Kotek
* GOV <governor.kotek@oregon.gov>
Date: Friday, July 17, 2026 3:26 PM UTC-07:00
Subject: RE: R000879-070126 and R000885-070726 — portal date-field constraint; end dates entered are placeholders to be read as through the date of search

Dear Ms. Duke,

I am writing to correct the record on the temporal scope of R000879-070126 and R000885-070726, and to document a defect in the Department's public records portal.

The portal's date fields.

The GovQA portal does not permit submission of a public records request without selecting both a beginning date and an end date. There is no option to specify "to the present," "ongoing," or "through the date of the Department's search." A requester who wishes to request records through the present is compelled by the interface to enter a fixed date that does not express what is being requested.

I state plainly what that produces. A requester seeking records through the present must enter a placeholder end date. The Department is then in a position to read that placeholder as a limit the requester chose, and to treat records created after it as outside the scope of a request that was never intended to exclude them. The interface converts a system constraint into an apparent election by the requester.

The Oregon Public Records Law contains no provision authorizing a public body to require that a request be bounded by a fixed end date. ORS 192.311(5) defines a public record without reference to any such limitation, and nothing in ORS 192.324 conditions a request on the requester's use of a date field in an agency's software. A request is defined by what it asks for. It is not defined by the fields a vendor's form makes available.

I am not, in this letter, asking the Department to explain the design of its portal. I am recording that the constraint exists, that I encountered it, and that I was required to work within it.

The correction.

The body of R000879-070126 states the time period as January 1, 2024 to the present. The body of R000885-070726 states the period as January 1, 2022 to the present. Those are the requests. Any end date appearing in the portal's date field for either request is a placeholder entered solely because the interface would not permit submission without one.

For both requests, the end date recorded in the portal is to be read as **the date on which the Department

completes its search**. Records created, sent, received, or maintained after the placeholder date and before the completion of the Department's search are within scope and are responsive.

I ask the Department to confirm in writing that it has construed both requests accordingly. If the Department has construed either request as terminating on the placeholder date, I ask it to state that expressly and to identify the date it applied.

I also ask the Department to state the end date its system currently records for each request.

Why this is not academic.

On July 17, 2026, Chris Liedle, Communications Director, wrote to me regarding these requests. That correspondence names me and concerns the handling of a matter with legal, risk, and accountability dimensions. I have entered it into the portal myself, on the requests to which it pertains.

It is a record. It is in the Department's possession. It postdates any placeholder end date. And it is responsive to the very category the Department closed on July 10 on the representation that it holds no record in which I am named or identifiably described in connection with personnel, human resources, legal, risk, or accountability matters.

The Department's own correspondence with me about these requests is responsive to these requests. So is the record of the routing decision that sent public records correspondence to the Department's press office. So is the July 6, 2026 closure of R000879, which was issued in the same message that acknowledged the request, five days after receipt, and which referred me to the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department as the custodian of "responsive agency personnel records" one of the five categories I requested, and not the one that asks for the Department's own communications with the Office of the Governor, which the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department is not a party to and cannot produce.

All of it sits in the Department's request tracking system, with timestamps, authorship, and disposition fields attached. R000885-070726 asks for an export of that system.

Restated.

The preservation notice served July 7, 2026 extends to all of the foregoing, including all portal records, request logs, disposition data, routing records, and correspondence relating to R000879-070126 and R000885-070726 themselves.

The four items outstanding since July 8 and July 10 remain outstanding: identification of the public body for which the Department claims to have acted as agent under ORS 192.311(2)(b), or withdrawal of the custodial determination; documentation of the search underlying the no-records finding; estimated completion dates under ORS 192.324(2)(b) for both requests; and confirmation that the July 7 preservation notice was received and distributed.

I renew my request for a fee waiver on public interest grounds under ORS 192.324(5) as to both requests.

Sincerely,

Robert Samuel White

Founder, Autonomy Realms

Owner, eNetwizard Inc.

Former Oregon State Parks Volunteer

Current U.S. Forest Service Caretaker

Steward, oprdvolunteerabuse.org

From: Robert Samuel White <rsw@rswfire.com>
To: "bryanna.duke@das.oregon.gov" <bryanna.duke@das.oregon.gov>
Cc: "das.mediarelations@das.oregon.gov" <das.mediarelations@das.oregon.gov>, Governor Kotek * GOV <governor.kotek@oregon.gov>
Date: Friday, July 17, 2026 4:59 PM UTC-07:00
Subject: RE: R000879-070126 and R000885-070726 — correction: petitions in this matter lie under ORS 192.411, not 192.415

Dear Ms. Duke,

A correction, in my own name, before anything further goes out.

I have cited ORS 192.415 in my correspondence with the Department. That is the wrong statute. The Department of Administrative Services is a state agency, and review of a state agency's denial goes to the Attorney General under ORS 192.411. ORS 192.415 is the district attorney route, for public bodies that are not state agencies. The forum I named was right. The citation was mine to get right, and I did not.

I am correcting it here rather than letting it stand, because I would rather be the one who finds my errors than have someone else find them for me.

I want to say plainly where I understand this to be going. R000879-070126 was closed on July 6, 2026 on a custodial determination I have set out the statutory grounds against and which the Department has neither defended nor withdrawn. R000885-070726 was acknowledged July 8, 2026 without the estimated completion date ORS 192.324(2)(b) requires; that period runs out July 22, 2026. I expect this matter to move to the Attorney General, and if necessary beyond.

I am conscious of what that means. Anything I put in a filing is a representation I have to be able to support, in full, on the record, without qualification. People lose these matters not because the facts were against them but because they overstated one thing and handed the other side something true to point at. I am not going to do that.

So I will keep saying only what the record says, and I will keep correcting myself in writing when I am wrong, including when it costs me nothing to stay quiet.

Outstanding: identification of the public body for which the Department claims to have acted as agent under ORS 192.311(2)(b), or withdrawal of the custodial determination; documentation of the search underlying the July 10 no-records finding; estimated completion dates for both requests; and confirmation that the preservation notice served July 7 was received and distributed. My correction regarding the portal's date fields stands, as does my fee waiver request under ORS 192.324(5).

Sincerely,

Robert Samuel White

Founder, Autonomy Realms

Owner, eNetwizard Inc.

Former Oregon State Parks Volunteer

Current U.S. Forest Service Caretaker

Steward, oprdvolunteerabuse.org

From: Robert Samuel White <rsw@rswfire.com>
To: "das.mediarelations@das.oregon.gov" <das.mediarelations@das.oregon.gov>
Cc: "bryanna.duke@das.oregon.gov" <bryanna.duke@das.oregon.gov>, Governor Kotek * GOV
<governor.kotek@oregon.gov>
Date: Friday, July 17, 2026 7:56 PM UTC-07:00
Subject: your role in the Department's public records function

Mr. Liedle,

Do you hold any role in the Department's public records function?

You wrote to me on July 17 about the status of R000879-070126 and R000885-070726 that the Department is continuing to process them in the order received, and that periods without communication do not indicate inactivity. Those are assertions of fact about two specific requests.

The Department's public records page designates Bryanna Duke as the contact for public records requests. As Communications Director, you are her supervisor. Does that make your statements the Department's response under ORS 192.329, or are they something else?

Thank you.

Robert Samuel White

From: MEDIARELATIONS * DAS <DAS.MediaRelations@DAS.oregon.gov>
To: Robert Samuel White <rsw@rswfire.com>, DUKE Bryanna * DAS <Bryanna.DUKE@das.oregon.gov>, MEDIARELATIONS * DAS <DAS.MediaRelations@DAS.oregon.gov>
Cc: Governor Kotek * GOV <Governor.Kotek@oregon.gov>
Date: Friday, July 17, 2026 9:06 PM UTC
Subject: RE: R000879-070126 and R000885-070726 — outstanding determinations, and notice of intent to petition under ORS 192.415

Hi Robert,

I'm not able to address the specific requests in your email at this moment, but I want to reassure you that we are continuing to process your public records requests in the order they are received.

We are currently experiencing a high volume of complex requests, many of which require multiple steps to complete.

Thank you for your patience, and please note that periods without communication do not indicate inactivity on our end.

Thanks for understanding,
Chris

[DAS logo]
Chris Liedle (he, him)
Communications Director
Oregon Department of Administrative Services<<https://www.oregon.gov/das/Pages/index.aspx>>

From: Robert Samuel White <rsw@rswfire.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2026 1:32 PM
To: DUKE Bryanna * DAS <bryanna.duke@das.oregon.gov>; MEDIARELATIONS * DAS <DAS.MediaRelations@DAS.oregon.gov>
Cc: Governor Kotek * GOV <governor.kotek@oregon.gov>
Subject: Re: R000879-070126 and R000885-070726 — outstanding determinations, and notice of intent to petition under ORS 192.415

Forwarded to DAS.MediaRelations@DAS.oregon.gov<mailto:DAS.MediaRelations@DAS.oregon.gov> per Ms. Duke's auto reply.

From: Robert Samuel White
Sent: Friday, 17 July 2026 13:30:42
To: bryanna.duke@das.oregon.gov<mailto:bryanna.duke@das.oregon.gov>
<bryanna.duke@das.oregon.gov<mailto:bryanna.duke@das.oregon.gov>>
Cc: Governor Kotek * GOV <governor.kotek@oregon.gov<mailto:governor.kotek@oregon.gov>>

Subject: RE: R000879-070126 and R000885-070726 — outstanding determinations, and notice of intent to petition under ORS 192.415

Dear Ms. Duke,

I am writing regarding R000879-070126 and R000885-070726.

Over the past ten days I have asked the Department four direct questions. Each has a form the statute supplies. None has been answered.

On July 8, I set out the analysis under ORS 192.311(2)(b) showing that the agent exception is unavailable as to the Department's own correspondence — DAS creates, sends, receives, and maintains its own email as a principal, not as an agent holding another body's records — and unavailable as to DAS–Governor's office communications on the exception's own "not otherwise available" proviso, since OPRD is not a party to them and cannot produce them. I asked the Department to identify the public body for which it claims to have been acting as agent, and the basis for that agency relationship, or to withdraw the determination. Nine days. Neither.

On July 10 and again on July 12, I asked the Department to document the search that produced its "no records" determination: custodians and offices searched, systems and repositories queried, date range, terms and identifiers, and whether the search accounted for identifiable description and not only my name. Seven days. Nothing.

On July 10, I asked for the completion date ORS 192.324 requires for the portion of R000879 still under review. Seven days. No date.

On July 8, the Department acknowledged R000885-070726 without the estimated completion date that ORS 192.324(2)(b) requires when a response will exceed ten business days of acknowledgment. That period expires July 22.

On July 7, I served notice of the duty to preserve as to both requests. Ten days. No acknowledgment that it was received or distributed.

Here is what that pattern is. "Not the custodian" is not an administrative convenience. Under ORS 192.329(2)(d) it is a formal written representation, and it is the only representation available to a body in possession of records that wishes to disclaim them. When that representation is challenged on the statute and the Department neither defends it nor withdraws it, the determination is not being maintained. It is being left standing without support, in a posture where it continues to operate against me while no one has to own it. The same is true of the "no records" finding: a determination about a search that the Department will not describe is a conclusion with nothing under it.

I am not asking the Department to characterize anything. I am asking it to answer for its own representations, in its own name, under a statute that requires exactly that.

So I am asking, plainly, for the following.

1. Identify the public body for which DAS claims to have acted as agent under ORS 192.311(2)(b), and the basis for that agency relationship — or withdraw the custodial determination and dispose of the request in one of the three lawful forms: production, production with itemized exemptions cited record by record, or an express written statement that no responsive records exist.
2. Document the search underlying the "no records" determination: custodians and offices, systems and repositories, date range, terms and identifiers, and whether identifiable description was accounted for.
3. Provide the estimated completion date for the portion of R000879 still under review, and for R000885-070726.
4. Confirm receipt and distribution of the July 7 preservation notice, and state whether any potentially responsive record has been destroyed, purged, overwritten, or aged off a retention schedule since July 7, and if so, what and when.

I would prefer to resolve this with you. That preference is real and I have acted on it for three weeks. But it is not unlimited, and I want the path stated rather than implied.

If the Department does not respond substantively, I intend to petition the Attorney General under ORS 192.415 for an order requiring disclosure, and to raise both the custodial determination and the adequacy of the search in that petition. R000885 asks how the Department makes custodial-basis determinations and what standard governs them. A petition that reaches that question reaches it for every requester the determination has been used against, not only me. I would rather the Department answer it here.

I renew my request for a fee waiver on public interest grounds under ORS 192.324(5) as to both requests. I am not seeking these records for any commercial purpose.

Sincerely,

Robert Samuel White
Founder, Autonomy Realms
Owner, eNetwizard Inc.
Former Oregon State Parks Volunteer
Current U.S. Forest Service Caretaker
Steward, oprdvolunteerabuse.org

FROM Merilee Nowak, Oregon Department of Administrative Services
TO Robert Samuel White <rsw@rswfire.com>
DATE July 27, 2026
SUBJECT **RE: Public Records Request of July 01, 2026, Reference # R000879-070126**

Dear Robert Samuel White,

In response to your public records request for the following:

"Any communication between your agency and the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department, the Office of the Governor, or any other state entity that references me."

The Oregon Department of Administrative Services has reviewed its files and has determined there are no responsive record(s) to your request. Another helpful resource may be a request directly to Oregon Parks and Recreation at this link: [Oregon Parks and Recreation : Public Records Request : About Us : State of Oregon](#)

For questions or additional information, please reply to this email. Your request is now closed.

Sincerely,

Merilee Nowak
Oregon Department of Administrative Services

To monitor the progress or update this request please log into the Public Records Center (GovQA).

FROM OREGONDAS Support <oregondas@govqa.us> (Merilee Nowak, DAS)
TO Robert Samuel White <rsw@rswfire.com>
DATE July 27, 2026
SUBJECT **RE: Public Records Request of July 07, 2026, Reference # R000885-070726**
ATTACHMENT 2024-DOJ_PUBLIC_RECORDS_Manual.pdf

Dear Robert Samuel White,

The Oregon Department of Administrative Services received a Public Records Request from you on July 07, 2026. Please see the information below:

1. The number of public records requests the Department has closed, denied, or otherwise disposed of on the basis that DAS is not the custodian of the requested records (including dispositions referring the requester to another agency as custodian), broken down by year.

Number of requests where DAS was not custodian of requested records:

2026 = 6
2025 = 19
2024 = 6
Total = 31

2. Any written policy, procedure, guidance, standard, or training material governing how and when the Department determines that it is not the custodian of requested records, and how such a determination is distinguished from a "no responsive records" determination.

DAS uses guidelines provided by the Oregon Department of Justice for public records requests. A copy of this guidance is attached.

3. Any record reflecting the standard applied in making custodial-basis dispositions - for example, checklists, decision templates, internal instructions, or correspondence establishing the criteria used.

There are no additional guidelines used other than attached manual.

For questions or additional information, please reply to this email.

Sincerely,

Merilee Nowak
Oregon Department of Administrative Services