
REQUEST FOR FACILITATED DISPUTE RESOLUTION: STATE OF OREGON

TO	Todd Albert, Public Records Advocate
CC	Yufeng Luo, Deputy Public Records Advocate
FROM	Robert Samuel White, P.O. Box 334, Reedsport, Oregon 97467
DATE	October 14, 2026
RE	Your reply of October 13, 2026; a request that you look at four institutions and negotiate with them
TESTIMONY	v1.11
AI DISCLOSURE	How this record is made.

Mr. Albert,

For more than a year I have written to my government about its treatment toward me, and it has largely been silent, except when it sent police to my door to tell me I was not in trouble. And when I requested the public records to find out what was done with my letters, I was met with every plain act a government can engage in to prevent me from seeing those records. That is not how public records are supposed to work, and I am asking the Public Records Advocate to do something about that.¹

I am requesting facilitated dispute resolution under ORS 192.464 with each of the four institutions I have open requests with. The record shows one pattern. The four are the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department, the Oregon State Police, the Office of the Governor, and the Oregon Department of Justice. Every document cited here is published in full, with its date, at oprdivolunteerabuse.org.

WHAT THE RECORDS ARE ABOUT

In 2025 I was an unpaid volunteer for the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department at Jessie M. Honeyman Memorial State Park. Two months of escalating coercion for documenting mistreatment ended on March 24, 2025, when OPRD dismissed me with twenty-four hours to vacate the park where I lived, and two days later excluded me permanently from every OPRD volunteer program, citing my public comments about staff.^{2, 3, 4} On August 24, 2025, I asked the Director for five protections for every volunteer.⁵ She replied that my concerns would be reviewed through channels she never identified,⁶ then did not write me for three and a half months. On December 8, 2025, she answered a request for five protections with a letter that called this “deeply painful” and wished me “a sense of purpose and healing,” with not one word about the five.⁷ On November 18, 2025, I wrote to the Governor for the first time.⁸

In March 2026, an OPRD emergency manager I had never corresponded with sent my letters to the press captain of the Oregon State Police, copying the Deputy Director, and the next morning the press captain requested a threat assessment “asap.” Over three weeks Detective Jake Hyde, an Oregon State Police detective assigned to an FBI task force, sent my name to the FBI from his FBI account, the OPRD emergency manager sent it to the Department of Justice’s fusion center, Hyde sent my driver’s record to Detective Jerred Nelson, and a Forest Service agent pinned the place where I sleep in a hunting app, sent the screenshots to Hyde, who forwarded them to Nelson, and reported that my supervisor “was told not to advise WHITE that FS LE was inquiring about his whereabouts.” Nelson named me “Suspect” for “publicly airing grievances.” One year to the day after the dismissal, three officers came through a locked federal gate into a secured facility where I live and work to tell me I was “not in trouble.”⁹ On April 2, 2026, I

served Oregon State Police a preservation notice and a public records request. On April 15, 2026, Nelson, one of the men who drove sixty-nine minutes to show up at my door, wrote: “there is no evidence White has committed any crimes.”^{10, 1}

I wrote to my government about how it treated me, and it answered with the police. When I asked for the records of what it did, OPRD hid its answer where I could not see it and priced the records out of reach, Oregon State Police told me records did not exist while it held them and then withheld the ones that show what its people did, the Office of the Governor called my request personal and denied the waiver, and the Department of Justice has not answered one question.

OREGON PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT

OPRD has obstructed from the first request.

On August 22, 2025, I filed a public records request with OPRD at its public records address, carrying my mailing address and my email address.¹¹ Its automatic reply read: “Expect to hear back from us in about 10 business days.”¹² On August 28, an OPRD employee telephoned to ask me to narrow the request. I declined and asked for everything in writing. After that call, OPRD wrote me nothing for eighty-five days. On November 15, 2025, I served the Director notice that the request had been held eighty-five days.¹³ On November 20, 2025, Katie Gauthier wrote: “Below is an image of the response we provided to you on August 29, 2025.” The image was of a portal I had no access to and was never told existed. In the same letter: “OPRD has not received any response from you regarding whether you would like to refine the request.”¹⁴ She put her answer where I could not see it, then put in writing that I was the one who had not answered. The answer she enclosed priced one category at “a minimum of forty hours or more,” another at sixty to eighty hours, and a third at “more than 40 hours.”¹⁴ That evening I withdrew the request. OPRD had shown me what it would do with it: a response posted where I could not see it, ninety days of silence to the addresses I gave, and “a cost barrier large enough to function as a denial of access.”¹⁵ On November 25, 2025, the portal sent me its first message, closing the request. It was the first sign my email address had been added to the account, three months after the day OPRD claims it answered me there.^{16, 17}

On April 2, 2026, nine days after the police came to my door, I asked OPRD for every communication with law enforcement about me and everything internal referencing me or the archive.¹⁸ On April 14, Gauthier sent an estimate dated April 10. It priced the volunteer program categories at forty to eighty hours each and the law enforcement records at two to five hours.¹⁹ The same day, I rejected the estimate, asked for a fee waiver on indigence and public interest grounds, and asked for immediate production of the low-cost items.²⁰ On April 27, I wrote: “Thirteen days have passed. I have received no response.”²¹ On April 29, Gauthier wrote that she was developing a response and would have it to me by May 1.²² On May 1 at 6:30 PM, I wrote: “No records have been received. No communication has been received. Your written commitment of April 29, 2026 has not been fulfilled.”²³ On May 4, Gauthier answered a request for OPRD’s communications about me with three manuals: its volunteer policy, its dismissal guidance, and its staff guide. Of the waiver she wrote: “We have provided cost estimates at the reduced rate outlined in OAR 736-001-0030(2).” She neither granted it nor denied it. Of the law enforcement emails, the records that would show what preceded the visit to my door, she wrote that she was “hopeful to have that information for you in the next week.”²⁴ On May 3, someone left a box of spent twelve-gauge shotgun shells, soaked in urine, in the road in front of my gate. I reported it to the Director, the Interim Director, and the Deputy Director that evening.²⁵ On May 4, I closed every request with OPRD.²⁶

On September 3, 2026, Oregon State Police produced sixteen files under PR27478, and I read what OPRD’s emergency manager had sent the police, copying the Deputy Director. On September 5, I filed a narrow request: every communication, note, calendar entry, and instruction concerning me held by Director Lisa Sumption and Deputy Director J.R. Collier. It asked for a fee waiver under ORS 192.324(5) and stated the grounds: “These records concern how the two highest officials of a state agency handled a documented complaint of retaliation by their own

staff, and the conduct that followed. I have no commercial purpose. All records produced will be published in full, at no charge, at oprdvoluteerabuse.org.”²⁷ The same day I asked the Oregon Department of Transportation for the same records on its devices. ODOT answered within one business day, confirmed with Director Sumption personally that anything responsive was on OPRD devices, and closed.^{28, 29} On September 11, Gauthier acknowledged the request and promised an estimate by September 22.³⁰ On September 11, I filed a second request: every version and revision of the “Timeline of Events” OPRD gave the Oregon State Police, the version log, and every email that transmitted any version.³¹ On September 18, Gauthier sent two estimates eight minutes apart. The September 5 request: fifty to fifty-four hours, \$1,600 to \$1,728, of which forty hours are for “All notes, memoranda, summaries, or other records authored by either individual concerning me.”³² The September 11 request: two and a half hours, \$80, and a denial that the version log exists, “This is not a record we have,” on the same page that agrees to produce the SharePoint or OneDrive version histories of the same file.³³ Neither estimate grants, denies, or mentions the fee waiver.^{32, 33} I disputed both the same day, asked for a written decision on the waiver, and gave notice that I would sue for the records if OPRD did not release them in full.^{34, 35} On September 26, I asked OPRD in writing to decide the waiver at the level of its custodian.³⁶ OPRD has written me nothing since September 18.

Under OPRD’s own rule, OAR 736-001-0030(2), the waiver is decided by “the Director or designee.” The Director is a subject of the request. Under ORS 192.329(3)(a), OPRD’s obligation to complete its response is suspended until the fee is paid or waived. Under ORS 192.329(3)(b), the request closes sixty days after the fee notice. Katie Gauthier noticed the fee on September 18. The Director has not decided the waiver, and the statute lets OPRD close the request on November 17 without her ever deciding it.

ORS 192.464(2)(b) and (c) both apply: a fee waiver asserted under ORS 192.324(5) and not granted, and a written estimate that exceeds the actual cost of two people’s own notes and calendar entries.

OREGON STATE POLICE

Oregon State Police told me records did not exist while it held them, charged me for them, and withheld four of them under exemptions that do not fit.

On April 2, 2026, nine days after its detectives came to my door, I served OSP a preservation notice and a request for every record of the visit.¹⁰ Central Records answered that afternoon with a link to its request form.³⁷ On April 3, I wrote that I would complete the form and asked Central Records to acknowledge the preservation notice.³⁸ Central Records never did. I asked again on July 15 and July 17.^{39, 40} On July 23, OSP’s risk office confirmed a litigation hold by mail.⁴¹ On April 3, I re-filed the request on the form. The form asked: “If any records are withheld, please provide the specific statutory exemption claimed for each withheld record,” and requested a fee waiver on public interest grounds.⁴² The same day, Marni L. Carlson told me no records existed: “The Department has conducted a search which identified no records responsive to your request.”⁴³ An hour later I asked her five questions: what systems were searched, whether the dispatch logs for March 24 were searched, whether the records for Oregon plate 731 QRV were searched, and what had been withheld.⁴⁴ She never answered them. On April 13, she admitted one record existed, a CAD record, priced it at \$12.50 by check or money order, and added below the list: “The body cam is exempt from disclosure.”⁴⁵ That evening I asked for a fee waiver and told her I am a volunteer caretaker living in an RV on federal land with no regular income.^{46, 47} On April 14, Carlson answered the statement of indigence with a form to print, complete by hand, sign, and mail.⁴⁸ I answered the same day.⁴⁹ OSP then wrote me nothing for three months. On July 9, I set out the sequence to Carlson in writing and renewed the waiver, copying the Governor.⁵⁰

On July 14, Micah Hubbard released the CAD record in full, free, reviewed for exempt material “with none being identified.” It named one officer, “Hyde, Jake,” and described the visit as “FOR THE FOREST SERVICE,” a follow-up interview with me.⁵¹ Ten days later the District Ranger wrote that the Forest Service did not initiate the interview.⁹ Between July 14 and July 19, I wrote to Hubbard seven times, with two corrections of my own: the other personnel and the vehicle;⁵² six questions on the event for the responding unit’s supervisor, including where OSP got my date of

birth;⁵³ the identity of DPSST 48454;⁵⁴ the dispatch communications and CAD audit trail the record indexes;⁵⁵ every category of the April 3 request still without a disposition;³⁹ whether the records under my preservation notice still existed;⁴⁰ and notice that I would petition the Attorney General.⁵⁶ Hubbard answered none of them. On July 22, I petitioned the Attorney General.⁵⁷ On July 27, five days later, Hubbard reversed the no-records answer: “A thorough review of your request has resulted in the finding of additional records, not in our system at the time of the original request.”⁵⁸ On July 29, the Attorney General’s order stated that OSP had responded “citing the exemption for body camera video provided by ORS 192.345(40).”⁵⁹ No one at OSP had cited that exemption to me for any named record. The next morning, David Pitcher of the Department of Justice wrote that the reference “comes from the exhibits attached to your petition. Specifically, page 20/89”: the April 13 fee letter.⁶⁰ On July 29, I asked OSP in writing for the recording and set out the public interest.⁶¹ No one at OSP has answered on the public interest, then or since.

On August 11, Hubbard identified six kinds of records responsive to the request Carlson had answered with “no records,” withheld the body camera video under ORS 192.345(40) with its condition cut out, and charged me \$157.50 to see the rest.⁴² On August 14, I wrote that I would pay by mailed check and asked for three things: written confirmation of receipt, an accounting of the time actually spent, and notice before any work beyond the estimate.⁶² No answer. On August 20, I wrote that the funds were secured: “I ask professional, competent questions to both of you and they are met with silence.”⁶³ On August 21, I sent the tracking number.⁶⁴ On August 24, the Postal Service attempted delivery during OSP’s posted business hours and no one signed for it. On August 25, I wrote twice asking Central Records to collect the check and confirm receipt in writing.^{65, 66} No answer. On August 29, the Postal Service told me the delivery was resolved. OSP did not.⁶⁷ On September 3, 2026, OSP produced sixteen files and refunded \$95.¹ OSP withheld four more that its own files name: the body-worn camera video of the March 24 contact, “OSP Hasty Form Robert White.pdf,” “WHITE,ROBERT SAMUEL DMV.pdf,” and “ReportRobertWhite.pdf.” I listed them the same morning, with the telephone records, text messages, and calendar entries the produced emails show must exist, and asked for each to be produced or its exemption stated.⁶⁸ On September 24, I asked again.⁶⁹ On September 28, twenty-five days after the first ask and three days after its deadline, Hubbard cited exemptions.⁷⁰

The exemptions do not hold.

“OSP Hasty Form Robert White,” withheld under ORS 192.345(23). The statute exempts records that would reveal “security measures, or weaknesses or potential weaknesses in security measures, taken or recommended to be taken to protect” four things: an individual, buildings or other property, information systems, or lottery operations. OSP’s own emails describe this record: “Please see attached Hasty Plan for Robert White knock and talk.”¹ It is the plan to come to my door. It protected none of the four. Nelson, Hyde, and Oliver came through the gate on March 24. On April 15, Nelson wrote “No further action.”¹

The body-worn camera video, withheld under ORS 192.345(40). ORS 192.345 is conditional. Every record in it is exempt “unless the public interest requires disclosure in the particular instance.” OSP’s April 13 letter, its August 11 letter, and its September 28 letter each quote subsection (40) and each cut that clause out of the statute.^{45, 42, 70} On July 29, I set out the public interest in writing, identified the event by number, date, and time as the subsection requires, stated that the only member of the public in the recording is me, and consented to the disclosure of my own image.⁶¹ OSP has never answered on the public interest. The report OSP produced says of the contact: “For exact details and statements please see attached BWC.”¹ The recording is the account of what three officers did at my door. I am the member of the public in it.

“WHITE,ROBERT SAMUEL DMV,” withheld under ORS 192.355(9) and ORS 802.181, and ORS 192.355(8) and 18 U.S.C. 2721. Both laws govern “personal information” from a motor vehicle record. ORS 802.175(3) defines it: driver license number, name, address, and telephone number. Every one of those is mine, and I know all four. 18 U.S.C. 2721(b)(13) permits disclosure “if the requester demonstrates it has obtained the written consent of the

individual to whom the information pertains,” and ORS 802.179(12) provides the same for a notarized consent. I am the individual. ORS 192.338 requires that exempt and nonexempt material be separated and the nonexempt material made available. OSP withheld my own name and address from me, and everything else in the record with them.

“ReportRobertWhite,” withheld under ORS 192.355(8) and 28 CFR Part 20. OSP describes it as “certain LEDS/NCIC generated material.” ORS 181A.230(3) directs OSP to provide “each individual about whom criminal offender information has been compiled the right to inspect and challenge that criminal offender information.” I am that individual. On March 13, Hyde sent it to Nelson from his FBI account.¹ Nelson wrote of the file it belongs to: “there is no evidence White has committed any crimes.”

The categories without a disposition. The September 28 letter states: “We provided all located, responsive electronic communication records. We do not have call logs. We did not locate any recorded phone calls.”⁷⁰ Hubbard said nothing about the text messages, the calendar entries, the notes of the calls the emails arrange, the messages produced with headers and no body, or any other attachment to the two case files.⁶⁸

Outside Central Records, I have written to Captain Kennedy twice and quoted ORS 181A.250 in full to ten Oregon State Police addresses.^{71, 72, 73} No one has answered.

ORS 192.464(2)(a) and (c) both apply.

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR

From November 18, 2025 to September 3, 2026, I wrote to the Governor’s office thirteen times.^{8, 74} It did not answer one of them. Its first message to me, on September 8, 2026, acknowledged a public records request.⁷⁵

On September 5, 2026, I asked the Office of the Governor for the records it holds concerning me: how my correspondence was received and routed, whether the Governor was informed, any record of a decision not to respond, and what it exchanged with OPRD, OSP, DOJ, and DAS about me.⁷⁶ The fee waiver paragraph reads: “I request a waiver under ORS 192.324(5). Disclosure primarily benefits the general public. These records concern whether correspondence from a citizen to his Governor was the stated basis for a state police threat assessment, and an intimidating ‘knock and talk’ behind a locked gate on restricted federal land, and how that correspondence was handled by the office that received it. I have no commercial purpose. All records produced will be published in full, at no charge, at oprdvolunteerabuse.org.”⁷⁶

On September 22, Cameron D. Miles, Government Accountability Attorney, estimated \$572.50 and denied the waiver on all five factors.⁷⁷ The first: “The requester has demonstrated that this request relates to a personal, rather than a public interest.” The fourth, in full: “The requester has not demonstrated that this factor weighs in favor of granting a fee waiver.” The fifth: the requester “has not demonstrated the ability to disseminate the public records but merely stated that he can post it on a website.” That website publishes every record in this matter in full, as received, the day it arrives, including the September 3 OSP production and his denial. ORS 192.324(5) provides for a waiver or “a substantially reduced fee.” Reduction appears nowhere in the denial. He considered half the statute and called it a decision. I answered the same evening: “I will pay it. Send the instructions.”⁷⁸ On September 23, I asked for them a second time.⁷⁹ On September 24, Mr. Miles sent them.⁸⁰

On September 24, I petitioned the Attorney General on the waiver denial and on a fee set with no means to pay it.⁸¹ That afternoon, Deputy Attorney General Benjamin Gutman dismissed the petition: “Because your petition seeks records in the custody of the Governor, an elected official, we lack jurisdiction to consider your appeal and must respectfully dismiss your petition.”⁸² His order quoted ORS 192.427 as “it shall not be considered by the Attorney General * * *.” The words the asterisks replace are “or district attorney after a claim of right to withhold disclosure by an elected official.” ORS 192.427 applies “In any case in which a person is denied the right to inspect or to receive a copy of a public record in the custody of an elected official, or in the custody of any other person but as to which an

elected official claims the right to withhold disclosure.” No record was denied. The office priced the records and sent payment instructions. Governor Kotek claimed nothing. ORS 192.324(6) gives the Attorney General “the same authority in instances when a fee waiver or reduction is denied as when inspection of a public record is denied.” The Attorney General’s own Public Records and Meetings Manual states the bar this way: “Neither the Attorney General nor district attorney may review an elected official’s decision to withhold a record from inspection under the Public Records Law.”⁸³ I asked for reconsideration the same day.⁸⁴ On September 25, I filed a second petition on the fee waiver alone.⁸⁵ On October 1, Gutman dismissed it: “That authority does not include the authority to review decisions made by elected officials. See ORS 192.427; Public Records Order, Oct 2, 2014, Sebens.”⁸⁶ The words “decisions made by elected officials” appear in no statute. The 2014 order he cited is one paragraph of reasoning on a fee waiver denied on behalf of a named legislator.^{87, 88} On October 8, I asked why the October 1 order was not in the public records order collection at the State of Oregon Law Library.⁸⁹ On October 9, David Pitcher wrote that it “will be published.”⁹⁰ That evening I found it in the collection, listed under September 24 and described as “Requesting that the AG order the Oregon Governor’s Office to respond to a public records,” and asked that the date and the description be corrected.⁹¹

Your email of October 13 repeats the Attorney General’s position: that the Attorney General “does not have the authority to adjudicate appeals related to actions taken by an elected state official.”⁹² ORS 192.427 does not say that. It bars a petition where a record is withheld on an elected official’s claim of right. I ask you to read ORS 192.427 and ORS 192.324(6) beside the two orders. The question is also before the Public Records Advisory Council in my letter of October 8.⁹³

ORS 192.464(2)(b) applies. ORS 192.311(6) defines a state agency as “any state officer, department, board, commission or court created by the Constitution or statutes of this state.” ORS 192.464(1)(a) states that the Advocate “shall provide facilitated dispute resolution services when requested by a person described in subsection (2).” ORS 192.464(4)(b) states what follows when a state agency does not engage in good faith.

OREGON DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

On September 23, 2026, I filed a public records request with the Department of Justice: nine categories, bounded by my name, my two email addresses, my two domains, and my date of birth, including the fusion center’s March 11 email in native format and every record of research the fusion center conducted or considered concerning me.⁹⁴ On September 24, Shevaun M. Gutridge, Public Records Coordinator, acknowledged it: “Your public records request is very broad in scope and will likely require significant agency resources to process, resulting in a fee that will be costly given the scope of the request.” She invited narrowing and offered a fee estimate.⁹⁵ I answered within the hour. I offered to narrow, asked which of the nine categories carry the burden, asked how a request bounded by one person becomes very broad in scope, and asked for the fee estimate alongside whatever narrowing she proposed.⁹⁶

That was September 24. On October 14, 2026, twenty days later, Ms. Gutridge wrote: “This updates you on the status of your public records request. It appears that we need additional time to process your request. The new estimated completion date is October 28, 2026.”⁹⁷ She answered none of the three questions and did not send the fee estimate she had offered. No public records officer in this record has answered one question I put to them: not OPRD on the basis of its hours,^{36, 34} not Oregon State Police on the search it performed on April 3,⁴⁴ not the Department of Justice on what makes one person’s file very broad.⁹⁷ Ms. Greenlee, the analyst who wrote that she was documenting me, has not answered either of my letters asking what she documented, in what systems it is kept, and who holds it.^{98, 99}

The Department of Justice is also the office that dismissed both petitions on the Governor’s records, the office OPRD’s Deputy Director said my legal correspondence would go to,¹⁰⁰ and the office whose advice to Oregon State Police OSP withholds as privileged.¹⁰¹

ORS 192.464(2)(a) applies to a request that has been neither answered nor priced.

WHAT I ASK

The detective who came to my door wrote that there is no evidence I committed any crime. Each institution named here holds the records that show what its people wrote and did about me, and each is keeping them from me. OPRD hid its answer, priced the records out of reach, and has not decided the waiver. Oregon State Police told me records did not exist while it held them, cut the condition out of an exemption, and priced a form letter at \$16,315.¹⁰¹ The Office of the Governor called my request personal and denied the waiver. The Department of Justice has not answered one question. I ask you to look at how four institutions handle one person who asks for his own file, and to take each of them into facilitated dispute resolution under ORS 192.464.

Oregon Parks and Recreation Department: a written decision on the September 5 fee waiver, at the level of its custodian, as ORS 192.324(5) and OAR 736-001-0030(2) require, and a disposition of the version log that is a denial or a production.

Oregon State Police: the four named records, produced, or an exemption for each that states the public interest balancing ORS 192.345 requires and the segregation ORS 192.338 requires; a written disposition of every category in my September 3 letter; and a fee for PR36445 that reflects the actual cost of the record I asked for, in place of the \$16,315 quoted on August 11.^{102, 101}

Office of the Governor: a decision on the waiver or a reduction under ORS 192.324(5) that weighs the facts stated in the request, and production.

Oregon Department of Justice: an answer to my September 24 letter and the fee estimate it offered.

I will participate in good faith in every session you convene. Everything I send and receive will continue to be published.

My understanding is that your process is confidential under ORS 192.472. I request transparency for all proceedings. The records these institutions are withholding document their misconduct: a state agency sending a citizen's letters to the police, a threat assessment opened on those letters, a man named "Suspect" for "publicly airing grievances," a fusion center file on him, the place where he sleeps pinned in a hunting app. The way they have answered my requests for those records is misconduct of its own. A confidential proceeding would hide both from the public whose records law it violates. I will not take part in that. If that is the only remedy they offer, I will document it as I document everything, and I will continue to shine a light on this behavior.

For more than a year I have written to my government about its treatment toward me, and it has largely been silent, except when it sent police to my door to tell me I was not in trouble. And when I requested the public records to find out what was done with my letters, I was met with every plain act a government can engage in to prevent me from seeing those records. That is not how public records are supposed to work, and I am asking the Public Records Advocate to do something about that.

Respectfully,

Robert Samuel White

Sources

1. [Production by Oregon State Police under PR27478, September 3, 2026](#). The threat assessment report, both dispatch records, and the electronic communications with their attachments.
2. [Dismissal letter from OPRD, March 24, 2025](#).
3. [Exclusion letter from OPRD, March 26, 2025](#).

4. [Testimony of Robert Samuel White: \(Testimony v1.11, p. 181\) and \(Testimony v1.11, p. 258\).](#)
5. [Open letter to Director Lisa Sumption, OPRD, August 24, 2025.](#)
6. [Email from Director Lisa Sumption, OPRD, August 25, 2025.](#)
7. [Email from Director Lisa Sumption, OPRD, December 8, 2025.](#)
8. [Letter to Governor Tina Kotek, November 18, 2025.](#)
9. [Email from District Ranger Michele Holman, Forest Service, July 24, 2026.](#)
10. [Public records request and preservation notice to Oregon State Police, April 2, 2026.](#)
11. [Public records request to OPRD, August 22, 2025.](#)
12. [Automatic reply from OPRD Public Records, August 22, 2025.](#)
13. [Notice of violation to OPRD Public Records and Director Sumption, November 15, 2025.](#)
14. [Email from Katie Gauthier, OPRD, with the August 29, 2025 posting and estimates, November 20, 2025.](#)
15. [Email to Katie Gauthier, OPRD, withdrawing the request, November 20, 2025.](#)
16. [Closure notice from OPRD's NextRequest portal, November 25, 2025.](#)
17. [Email to Katie Gauthier, OPRD, on the portal's first message, November 25, 2025.](#)
18. [Public records request to OPRD, April 2, 2026.](#)
19. [Email from Katie Gauthier, OPRD, with the cost estimate dated April 10, 2026, April 14, 2026.](#)
20. [Letter to Katie Gauthier, OPRD, rejecting the estimate and requesting a fee waiver, April 14, 2026.](#)
21. [Email to Katie Gauthier, OPRD, April 27, 2026.](#)
22. [Email from Katie Gauthier, OPRD, April 29, 2026.](#)
23. [Email to Katie Gauthier, OPRD, May 1, 2026.](#)
24. [Email from Katie Gauthier, OPRD, May 4, 2026.](#)
25. [Letter to Director Lisa Sumption, Interim Director Stefanie Coons, and Deputy Director J.R. Collier, OPRD, May 3, 2026.](#)
26. [Email to Katie Gauthier, OPRD, closing all requests, May 4, 2026.](#)
27. [Public records request to OPRD for the records of Director Sumption and Deputy Director Collier, September 5, 2026.](#)
28. [Email from ODOT Public Records, September 8, 2026.](#)
29. [Email from ODOT Public Records, confirmed with Director Sumption, September 8, 2026.](#)
30. [Email from Katie Gauthier, OPRD, acknowledging the request, September 11, 2026.](#)
31. [Public records request to OPRD for every version of the Timeline of Events, September 11, 2026.](#)
32. [Email from Katie Gauthier, OPRD, with the estimate on the September 5 request, September 18, 2026.](#)
33. [Email from Katie Gauthier, OPRD, with the estimate on the September 11 request, September 18, 2026.](#)
34. [Letter to Katie Gauthier, OPRD, disputing both estimates, September 18, 2026.](#)
35. [Email to Katie Gauthier, OPRD, notice of suit, September 18, 2026.](#)
36. [Letter to OPRD, Oregon State Police, the Department of Justice, and the Office of the Governor, September 26, 2026.](#)
37. [Email from OSP Central Records, referral to the request form, April 2, 2026.](#)
38. [Email to OSP Central Records, asking acknowledgment of the preservation notice, April 3, 2026.](#)
39. [Letter to Micah Hubbard, OSP, on the categories requested April 3 and not produced, July 15, 2026.](#)
40. [Letter to Micah Hubbard, OSP, on the preservation status of the records, July 17, 2026.](#)
41. [Letter from Oregon State Police Risk Management, litigation hold on SP26-097765, July 23, 2026.](#)
42. [Fee letter from Micah Hubbard, Oregon State Police, PR27478, August 11, 2026.](#)
43. [Letter from Marni L. Carlson, Oregon State Police, April 3, 2026.](#)
44. [Email to Marni L. Carlson, Oregon State Police, five questions on the search, April 3, 2026.](#)

45. [Fee letter from Marni L. Carlson, Oregon State Police, April 13, 2026.](#)
46. [Letter to Marni L. Carlson, OSP, fee waiver request, April 13, 2026.](#)
47. [Letter to Marni L. Carlson, OSP, supplemental fee waiver request, April 13, 2026.](#)
48. [Email from Marni L. Carlson, OSP, with a fee waiver form, April 14, 2026.](#)
49. [Email to Marni L. Carlson, OSP, April 14, 2026.](#)
50. [Letter to Marni L. Carlson, OSP, July 9, 2026.](#)
51. [Email from Micah Hubbard, OSP, releasing CAD record SP26097765, July 14, 2026.](#)
52. [Email to Micah Hubbard, OSP, July 14, 2026.](#)
53. [Letter to Micah Hubbard, OSP, six questions for the responding unit's supervisor, July 14, 2026.](#)
54. [Email to Micah Hubbard, OSP, July 15, 2026.](#)
55. [Letter to Micah Hubbard, OSP, on the dispatch communications and CAD audit trail, July 15, 2026.](#)
56. [Letter to Micah Hubbard, OSP, July 19, 2026.](#)
57. [Petition to the Attorney General, July 22, 2026.](#)
58. [Email from Micah Hubbard, Oregon State Police, reopening PR27478, July 27, 2026.](#)
59. [Order of the Attorney General, DOJ File No. 257001-GA0140-26, July 29, 2026.](#)
60. [Email from David Pitcher, Oregon Department of Justice, July 30, 2026.](#)
61. [Letter to Micah Hubbard, Oregon State Police, requesting the recorded video of the March 24, 2026 contact, July 29, 2026.](#)
62. [Email to Micah Hubbard, OSP, on payment terms, August 14, 2026.](#)
63. [Email to Micah Hubbard and Holly Bolton, OSP, August 20, 2026.](#)
64. [Email to Micah Hubbard and Holly Bolton, OSP, with the tracking number, August 21, 2026.](#)
65. [Email to Micah Hubbard and Holly Bolton, OSP, August 25, 2026.](#)
66. [Email to Micah Hubbard and Holly Bolton, OSP, second of August 25, 2026.](#)
67. [Email to Micah Hubbard and Holly Bolton, OSP, with the Postal Service resolution, August 29, 2026.](#)
68. [Letter to Micah Hubbard and Holly Bolton, Oregon State Police, on the September 3 production, September 3, 2026.](#)
69. [Letter to Micah Hubbard and Holly Bolton, OSP, September 24, 2026.](#)
70. [Exemptions letter from Micah Hubbard, Oregon State Police, PR27478, September 28, 2026.](#)
71. [Letter to Captain Kyle Kennedy, OSP, September 27, 2026.](#)
72. [Letter to Oregon State Police on ORS 181A.250, September 27, 2026.](#)
73. [Letter to Captain Kyle Kennedy, OSP, October 8, 2026.](#)
74. [The thirteen letters, published in full.](#)
75. [Email from Yasmin Solorio, Office of the Governor, September 8, 2026.](#)
76. [Public records request to the Office of the Governor, September 5, 2026. Attached.](#)
77. [Email from Cameron D. Miles, Office of the Governor, denying the fee waiver, September 22, 2026. Attached.](#)
78. [Email to Cameron D. Miles, Office of the Governor, September 22, 2026.](#)
79. [Email to Cameron D. Miles, Office of the Governor, September 23, 2026.](#)
80. [Email from Cameron D. Miles, Office of the Governor, with payment instructions, September 24, 2026.](#)
81. [Petition to the Attorney General, September 24, 2026.](#)
82. [Order of the Attorney General, DOJ File No. 121010-GA0187-26, September 24, 2026.](#)
83. [Attorney General's Public Records and Meetings Manual, 2024, page 37.](#)
84. [Request for reconsideration to the Attorney General, September 24, 2026.](#)
85. [Second petition to the Attorney General, September 25, 2026.](#)

86. [Order of the Attorney General, DOJ File No. 121010-GA0187-26, October 1, 2026.](#)
87. [Email to the Department of Justice, Public Records Orders, October 1, 2026.](#)
88. [Email to David Pitcher, Oregon Department of Justice, with the 2014 order, October 9, 2026.](#)
89. [Email to the Department of Justice, Public Records Orders, October 8, 2026.](#)
90. [Email from David Pitcher, Oregon Department of Justice, October 9, 2026.](#)
91. [Email to David Pitcher, Oregon Department of Justice, October 9, 2026.](#)
92. [Email from Todd Albert, Public Records Advocate, October 13, 2026.](#)
93. [Letter to the Public Records Advisory Council, October 8, 2026.](#)
94. [Public records request to the Oregon Department of Justice, September 23, 2026.](#)
95. [Email from Shevaun M. Gutridge, Oregon Department of Justice, September 24, 2026.](#)
96. [Email to Shevaun M. Gutridge, Oregon Department of Justice, September 24, 2026.](#)
97. [Email from Shevaun M. Gutridge, Oregon Department of Justice, October 14, 2026.](#)
98. [Letter to Dianne Greenlee, Oregon Department of Justice, September 20, 2026.](#)
99. [Letter to Dianne Greenlee, Oregon Department of Justice, September 22, 2026.](#)
100. [Email from Deputy Director J.R. Collier, OPRD, February 14, 2026.](#)
101. [Fee letter from Micah Hubbard, Oregon State Police, PR36445, August 11, 2026.](#)
102. [Public records request to Oregon State Police, PR36445, July 30, 2026.](#)