

To Lisa Sumption, Director, Oregon Parks and Recreation Department
Copy J.R. Collier, Deputy Director, Oregon Parks and Recreation Department
From Robert Samuel White, P.O. Box 334, Reedsport, Oregon 97467 – rsw@rswfire.com
Date July 31, 2026
Subject Statewide HR Policy 50.010.02, Violence-Free Workplace, and its application to me

I. What this letter is

This letter asks you one question and requires an answer in writing.

The question is whether Statewide HR Policy 50.010.02, Violence-Free Workplace, or any behavioral threat assessment or threat management process operating under it, was applied to me.

I have put the same question to the Department of Administrative Services as a public records request. I am putting it to you directly because you administer the policy, because the answer is within your knowledge now, and because you will not be able to say later that you were not asked while there was still time to answer.

II. What I have asked DAS for

On July 29, 2026 I filed a public records request with the Department of Administrative Services. It asks for every record DAS holds concerning me; for any behavioral threat assessment, threat management, workplace violence assessment, or safety planning process concerning me, including reports made under 50.010.02, team records, referrals, assessment instruments, designations of me as a person of concern, and any recommendation to involve law enforcement; for all communications between DAS and OPRD concerning me; for all records reflecting disclosure of my personal information, including my date of birth, to any person or agency outside OPRD; and for the policy, its superseded version, its training, and any instrument used to carry it out, including any addressing its application to volunteers.

The request is subject to a litigation hold. It will be published with its response.

III. Why I suspect it

For sixteen months I have held a record that does not resolve under any ordinary reading. Each of the following is documented, and each one is strange on its own. Together they describe a process, not a series of decisions.

The profile. On March 25, 2025, in a recorded call, I was characterized in psychological terms and assigned a romantic motive I had explicitly denied. Nothing about ending a volunteer term requires that. A volunteer whose service is not wanted is simply not scheduled. A narrative of fixation, however, is what an assessment instrument requires before it can produce a subject.

The remedy. On March 26, 2025 I was permanently excluded from all OPRD volunteer programs statewide, on agency letterhead. Permanent statewide exclusion is not a volunteer management outcome. It is a safety outcome. Non-renewal was available and was not used.

The disclosure. OSP CAD event SP26097765 records my date of birth as entered on March 24, 2026. I did not give OSP my date of birth until April 3, 2026, ten days later. I was not an Oregon resident at the time, and my name returned nothing in state systems. The date of birth in that police record came from a volunteer file. Someone moved it.

The visit. Three armed officers came to a locked gate on restricted federal land on the one-year anniversary of my dismissal. The CAD shows the event as officer-initiated, with no call type, priority low, no action taken, unit type Criminal, my role listed as Other and my name in the caller field. The stated concern was what I was posting online. The responding federal agent called twenty minutes after leaving to say the matter was not going away. On July 23, 2026 my District Ranger stated in writing that the Forest Service did not initiate the interview and that its role was providing gate access. The dispatch comment attributing the visit to the Forest Service is therefore not accurate, and the origin lies with the party that supplied my date of birth.

The register. In December 2025 you described documented abuse as a person who is hurting, and closed communication. That is not the language of an agency reading a complaint. It is the language of an agency that has already characterized the complainant.

The encounter on March 18, 2025. An unidentified man photographed the yurts I was cleaning. I reported it the same day. The Park Supervisor told me he was an IT employee. In March 2026 I recognized the same man on a Forest Service trail, local, driving a state truck with no agency markings. The account I was given in writing does not survive that.

A dismissal explains none of this. A threat management process explains all of it at once.

IV. What the policy actually says

I have read 50.010.02 as published, effective November 1, 2024, two months before I began.

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.

Here is the inversion. On March 5, 2025, the Park Manager and the Park Supervisor summoned me to a picnic table in the public day-use area at Honeyman State Park and kept me there for sixty-two minutes. Two managers, one unpaid volunteer, no union, no HR access, no representation, in the open. I recorded all of it.

In that hour the Park Manager told me to chew glass and swallow it, and used the image a second time to describe what he was doing to me as a gift. He suggested I thought I had a future with my male supervisor, after I had explicitly stated the relationship was not romantic. He read from a handwritten page, claimed my emails contained words they did not contain, and could not produce them when asked. He instructed me to stop sending follow-up emails. Fifty minutes in, when I said I was not being given the benefit of the doubt, he said he might not be able to help me with that. The Park Supervisor sat silent for the first nineteen minutes, said the single word tone, and later confirmed on tape that she had attached a meaning to an email of mine that the email did not contain, and brought it to that table as evidence against me. At the end he told me four times that I did not have to stay.

Under Section 2, as written, that conduct is behavior a reasonable person would find intimidating, hostile and abusive, including psychologically. I have reported it in writing, with the recording, repeatedly, since.

Section 8 prohibits retaliation against a person who reports or experiences workplace violence. Under your own instrument, I am the reporting party. What followed my report – dismissal six days short of my term, keys collected within the hour, a psychological profile, permanent statewide exclusion citing my public comments about staff – is the prohibited act.

If the policy was used, it was used backwards.

V. The flaws in the instrument, which you should want fixed regardless of what you did to me

These are in the text.

1. Section 7 names volunteers among those who may be barred and terminated. Section 8 names only employees as protected from retaliation. The policy reaches a volunteer as a subject of enforcement and offers him nothing pointed back. That asymmetry is not an oversight in my case. It is the design, and it applies to every volunteer in the state.
2. Section 2 covers psychological harm and indirect expression by a reasonable person standard. Absent any limiting instruction, that language is broad enough to capture documented criticism of an agency and the public speech of a person the agency finds inconvenient. On March 5, 2025 I was instructed to stop sending follow-up emails. Nineteen days later I was dismissed,

and two days after that I was permanently excluded in a letter citing my public comments about staff. An instrument that treats a written record as tone, and tone as a threat, converts the act of documenting mistreatment into evidence of dangerousness. That is a speech ground on its face, and it is available against anyone.

3. Section 7 authorizes barring from the workplace. My exclusion is statewide and permanent, across every property and program the agency operates. That is broader than the text provides.
4. Section 6 permits disclosure of confidential information only on a need-to-know basis or where legally required, and conditions law enforcement referral on threats requiring the immediate attention of law enforcement. My date of birth reached a police system. The resulting contact was low priority, officer-initiated, with no action taken, a year after my dismissal, and required a sixty-nine minute drive in each direction. Nothing about that describes immediacy.
5. The policy as published contains no provision for notifying a person that he has been assessed, no opportunity to respond, and no review of a determination. A person can be profiled, referred, excluded, and visited by police without ever being told a process existed. I would not know to ask this question if a dispatcher had not written my date of birth in a log.
6. Section 1 states that the agency director administers this policy as the agency's violence-free workplace policy. Not a program manager. Not a park manager. You.

VI. What I am asking

Tell me whether 50.010.02, or any threat assessment or safety planning process, was applied to me. Tell me who initiated it, who participated, what was recorded, and to whom my information was disclosed. If no such process occurred, say so plainly and in writing, and the question closes.

I have made every off-ramp available to you for sixteen months and you have taken none of them. This is another one.

VII. Why this letter exists

The permanent exclusion of March 26, 2025 has never been withdrawn. Every agency act since has been in service of not withdrawing it.

I documented my treatment from the first week, before I knew what any of it would mean. That is the only reason this question can be asked at all. The next volunteer will not have recorded the meeting, will not have the dispatch record, will not notice a date of birth in a field where it could not have come from him, and will never learn that an authority created to prevent violence was pointed at him for writing an email about a power outage.

This letter and its answer, or the absence of one, will be published in full at oprdivolunteerabuse.org.

Respectfully,

Robert Samuel White