

A DEFECT IN STATEWIDE HR POLICY 50.010.02

TO Representative Boomer Wright, Oregon House District 9

COPY Senator Dick Anderson, Oregon Senate District 5; Lisa Sumption, Director, Oregon Parks and Recreation Department; Chief Human Resources Office, Oregon Department of Administrative Services; Office of Governor Tina Kotek

FROM Robert Samuel White, 82900 Highway 101, Florence, Oregon 97439 -- mailing address P.O. Box 334, Reedsport, Oregon 97467 -- rsw@rswfire.com -- 458-230-1869

DATE August 1, 2026

SUBJECT A defect in Statewide HR Policy 50.010.02 that applies to every executive branch agency

I. Why you are receiving this

I am your constituent. I live at 82900 Highway 101, Florence, Oregon 97439, in House District 9 and Senate District 5. I am writing about a document you can verify in ten minutes, without taking my word for anything.

Statewide HR Policy 50.010.02, Violence-Free Workplace, is issued by the DAS Chief Human Resources Office under ORS 240.306, 240.321, 240.555 and 240.560. It applies to every executive branch agency in Oregon. It has been in effect in its current form since November 1, 2024.

Read Section 7 and then Section 8.

Section 7 lists who may be barred and terminated under the policy. It names volunteers explicitly, alongside customers, vendors and visitors.

Section 8 prohibits retaliation against those who report or experience workplace violence. It names employees only.

The same document, on the same page, brings volunteers inside its enforcement reach and leaves them outside its protection. Whoever drafted it had volunteers in mind while writing one clause and not the other.

That is the whole of what I am asking you to look at. Everything below is why it matters.

II. What the policy does to a person it is pointed at

Section 2 defines workplace violence as behavior that to a reasonable person is intimidating, hostile, threatening, violent or abusive, and it expressly reaches psychological harm and indirect expression. That is a perception standard, not a conduct standard.

Section 6 authorizes assessment, investigation, and referral to law enforcement, and permits disclosure of confidential information on a need-to-know basis.

Section 7 authorizes barring and termination.

The policy as published contains no requirement that the person be told an assessment is occurring, no opportunity to respond, and no review of any determination. A person can be assessed, designated, excluded, and referred to police without ever learning that a process existed.

An instrument with those properties does not need to be abused to cause harm. It only needs to be used on the wrong person, and nothing in it will surface the error.

III. Why this is not theoretical

I volunteered for the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department at Honeyman State Park in early 2025. I am gay. A staff member drew that out of me in conversation and passed it up.

On March 5, 2025 a park manager and a park supervisor kept me at a picnic table in a public day-use area for sixty-two minutes. I was told to chew glass and swallow it. My sexuality was used against me. I was told to stop sending follow-up emails. I recorded all of it, and the recording is public.

On March 24, 2025 I was dismissed by phone, six days before my term ended. On March 26, 2025 I was permanently excluded from every OPRD volunteer program in Oregon, on agency letterhead, in a letter citing my public comments about staff.

On March 24, 2026, one year to the day after the dismissal, two Oregon State Police troopers and a federal agent came to a locked gate at my residence. The dispatch record shows the event as officer-initiated, no call type, priority low, no action taken, unit type Criminal. It also shows my date of birth entered that day. I did not give OSP my date of birth until ten days later. It came out of a volunteer file.

The dispatch comment states the visit was made for the Forest Service. On July 24, 2026 the District Ranger for the Central Coast Ranger District, Siuslaw National Forest, stated in writing that the Forest Service did not initiate the interview and that its involvement was limited to unlocking the gate and guiding Oregon State Police to the work center. The federal agency named in the police record does not stand behind the characterization. I have been the volunteer caretaker at that facility for more than a year, I remain in that position today, and the Forest Service has never raised a concern about my presence there.

I have asked the Department of Administrative Services whether 50.010.02, or any assessment process operating under it, was applied to me. I have asked the Director of OPRD the same question directly. Neither has answered.

I am not asking you to adjudicate my case. I am telling you that the instrument in Section I is not sitting unused.

IV. What nobody appears to know

I have asked DAS for the number of behavioral threat assessments, workplace violence assessments, or threat management processes initiated by executive branch agencies since January 1, 2023, in whatever form DAS maintains it.

There are two possible answers and you should be uncomfortable with both.

If DAS produces a number, then people have been excluded from state programs and premises under an instrument with no notice, no response, and no appeal, and the number will tell you how many.

If DAS cannot produce a number, then the state operates an exclusion mechanism it does not track, and no one in Oregon government can tell you how many people it has been used on or who they were.

I do not know which answer is coming.

V. What I am asking you to do

Three things, none of which require a bill or a committee.

1. Read Sections 7 and 8 and satisfy yourself that I have described them accurately.
2. Submit a legislative information request to DAS for the count described above, and for both the current and the superseded 02/01/2019 version of the policy, so the asymmetry can be dated. A legislative request is not subject to the fees and processing delays that a citizen's request is. I have been at this for sixteen months. You would have it in weeks.
3. Ask DAS-CHRO one question in writing: what protection does Statewide HR Policy 50.010.02 afford a volunteer who reports workplace violence. If the answer is none, that is a defect in a statewide policy affecting every volunteer, temporary employee, contractor, board member and member of the public who comes into contact with a state agency. It can be fixed with a sentence.

VI. What I am not asking you to do

I am aware that this letter contains material that could be used against a sitting governor and a sitting director, and that I am a gay man writing to a Republican legislator about a Democratic administration.

I want to be direct with you about that. If this is used as campaign material, I will say so publicly and disown that use, by name, in the same archive where everything else in this matter is published. Not because I am protecting anyone. Because the moment this becomes partisan it stops being true in the way that makes it useful, and the people it would actually help are volunteers in state agencies who have no party.

I am asking you to ask a question. I am not offering you a weapon, and I will not let it become one quietly.

VII.

Everything above is documented at oprdrvoluteerabuse.org, including the recording, the dispatch record, the exclusion letter, and every communication I have sent to the Department and received from it. Nothing in this letter depends on my characterization of anything.

I found this because a dispatcher typed my date of birth into a field where it could not have come from me, and because I had kept sixteen months of records nobody told me to keep. That is not a system of oversight. That is an accident.

This letter, and any response to it, will be documented at oprdrvoluteerabuse.org/accountability/legislation.

Respectfully,

Robert Samuel White
82900 Highway 101, Florence, Oregon 97439
Mailing: P.O. Box 334, Reedsport, Oregon 97467
rsw@rswfire.com
458-230-1869
<https://oprdrvoluteerabuse.org>