

FROM Robert Samuel White <rsw@rswfire.com>
TO "felicia.sloan@usda.gov" <felicia.sloan@usda.gov>
CC "Holman, Michele - FS, OR" <michele.holman@usda.gov>
DATE July 14, 2026, 12:27 PM PT
SUBJECT **USFS coordination of March 24 visit — OSP record PR27478**
ATTACHED SP26097765 CAD.pdf, PR27478.pdf

Dear Ms. Sloan,

OSP's released CAD characterizes the March 24 visit as conducted "for the Forest Service." Does USFS Law Enforcement support that characterization? Did USFS request or coordinate this visit? Please see my statement below.

Kind Regards,

Robert Samuel White

STATEMENT ON OREGON STATE POLICE RECORD PR27478

Robert Samuel White — July 14, 2026

Today the Oregon State Police released the CAD record for the March 24, 2026 visit to my residence on restricted federal land. I requested it months ago. On April 3, I was told records did not exist. On April 13, after I asked how the search was conducted, this record surfaced. It was withheld for three more months. Today it was released with a letter from OSP's own legal compliance specialist stating the document was reviewed for exempt material, "with none being identified."

There was nothing to withhold. By their own final admission, no exemption applied to any part of this record. The months of silence, the fee dispute, and the initial denial that records existed had no legal basis behind them. Their own counsel now certifies it.

Here is what the record shows, in their own system, in their own words.

The event was logged as "No Call Type Selected." Priority "Low." The final disposition was "No Action Taken." At the moment their officer created the event, there was no crime, no call type, and no police action to take. Their contemporaneous record establishes

there was no law-enforcement basis for the visit. There was no crime. There never was.

The unit dispatched was designated "Criminal." A criminal unit was sent to a man their own record classifies under "Role: Other" — not a suspect, not a witness, not a party to any crime. They pointed the criminal apparatus of the state at a person their own system does not connect to any criminal matter.

And the officer's own comment states the purpose: "FOR THE FOREST SERVICE // FOLLOWUP INTERVIEW W/ ROBERT WHITE."

I want to address that comment directly, because it is false, and the falseness matters.

The United States Forest Service did not need the Oregon State Police to conduct business with me. I live on Forest Service land. I am their volunteer caretaker. The federal officers who manage that land have my phone number, my email, my gate, and a relationship with me built over more than a year. If the Forest Service had a question for me, they had every ordinary means to ask it, directly, as they always have. There was no reason on earth for the state police to be dispatched "for the Forest Service" to a federal caretaker on federal land. The state has no jurisdiction there and the Forest Service had no need of them. "For the Forest Service" is not an explanation. It is a cover.

And this was not a "followup interview." A followup implies a prior interview, a continuing lawful process, a thread being continued. There was none. What there was, was a date. March 24, 2026 was the one-year anniversary of my dismissal from Oregon State Parks — the dismissal I had spent the preceding months documenting publicly as First Amendment retaliation. Three armed officers did not arrive on that specific day to "follow up" on a process that did not exist. They arrived on the anniversary, because of what I had written, to deliver a message. Their own officer, twenty minutes after I invoked a lawyer and closed my door, called me by phone to say the matter "was not going away" and that the state police wanted to speak with me. That is not a followup interview. That is intimidation, and the record's own timeline — arrival at 9:50, my refusal, the phone call after — bears it out.

So the record does not resolve the questions. It compounds them. Each explanation the state has offered collapses into the next lie. There was no crime — their disposition says so. There was no call type — their event says so. There was no exempt material — their lawyer says so. And now there is "for the Forest Service" and "followup interview," two more explanations that do not survive contact with the facts: the Forest Service did not need them, and there was no prior interview to follow.

What the record does give me is a name. The primary unit is identified as Jake Hyde, badge 56397. The Forest Service captain refused to give that name to my own district ranger, a forty-year federal officer, when she asked who had been on her land. The state sealed it on the federal side. Their own records section handed it to me on the state side. I now know one of the officers the federal government would not name.

I want to be precise about what I am claiming and what I am not. I am not alleging a specific crime by any individual officer. I am stating what the record states: that armed state police, in a criminal-designated unit, were dispatched to a federal caretaker on federal land, on the anniversary of his protected-speech dismissal, for no logged law-enforcement purpose, under a stated justification — "for the Forest Service" — that does not withstand scrutiny, and that this was recorded by the officers themselves. Every fact in this statement comes from the state's own record or from events I documented as they happened.

I did not go looking for a fight. I documented my treatment, which is my constitutional right. The state's answer to that documentation was to send officers to my home. Its answer to my request for the record of that visit was three months of silence with no lawful basis. And the record it finally released does not exonerate anyone. It confirms what I have said from the beginning, in the state's own hand: there was no crime, there was no basis, and the explanations offered for the visit are not true.

The full record is in the archive at oprdivolunteerabuse.org. I answer questions there and nowhere else.

— Robert Samuel White