

ARGUMENTS FOR SUPPORTING STUDY DESIGN

*Justice System & Public Safety Services
Study Design: 2015*



**Mike Walker & Jon Whalen, Members
JS&PSS Exploratory Committee
Hugo Neighborhood Association & Historical Society**

Draft October 2015

ARGUMENTS FOR SUPPORTING STUDY DESIGN
for
Justice System & Public Safety Services Study Design: 2015

Outline

INTRODUCTION

- I. JOSEPHINE COUNTY’S JUSTICE SYSTEM & PUBLIC SAFETY SERVICES PROBLEM/ISSUE

- II. ARGUMENTS FOR SUPPORTING STUDY DESIGN
 - 1. Core Values
 - 2. Purpose Of Study
 - 3. Study Process Unique
 - 4. Vetted Credible Facts
 - 5. Citizen Decision-Makers
 - 6. Summary

- III. WHAT STUDY DESIGN IS HOPED TO ACHIEVE
 - 1. Measuring Success of Study Design & Study in Outputs and Outcomes
 - 2. Outputs Are Measures of a Program's Activities
 - 3. Outcomes
 - 4. Key Outcomes Of Study
 - 5. Realistic and Achievable Outcomes
 - 6. Measurements & Records

- IV. AUTHORS

ACRONYMS & ABBREVIATIONS

TABLES

- Table 1. Josephine County, Oregon Levy Votes
- Table 2. JO CO Federal Payments History: 2000 - 2012

APPENDICES

- Appendix A. *Justice System & Public Safety Services Study Design: 2015*
- Appendix B. Summary Highlights: Arguments for Supporting Study Design

ACRONYMS & ABBREVIATIONS

- APS Analysis of Public Situation - The APS is a document that provides information to characterize the JO CO JS&PSS Issue profile, describe any limitations, and identify opportunities to respond to the identified JS&PSS issues. Why do we need it? This analysis provides the basis for the proposed issues, range of alternatives, and affected conditions of the *Study*, which is based primarily on socio-economic conditions, existing laws, and science, including the types of safety services for maintenance or development.
- Conditions Affected Conditions - A description of the existing conditions to be affected by the range of publicly identified alternatives.
- Committee Hugo JS&PSS Exploratory Committee.
- Hope Do better facts create, cause, or contribute to better decisions by the public? The authors will continue to try and serve a fresh source of public safety facts, researched and verified, to help citizens make better decisions and drive better conversations. The camaraderie of being part of a team, knowing defeat if it comes is O.K., as long as they show discipline and dedication with respect and sportsmanship in their drive for the facts. The belief that the benefits of common accurate facts to better explain the JO CO JS&PSS Issue is worth the effort.
- JO CO Josephine County, Oregon
- JS&PSS Issue Josephine County's Justice System & Public Safety Services (JS&PSS) Problem/Issue.
- Legitimate All citizens, voters, and votes are legitimate.
- Neutral *Study* to be researched and written from a neutral point of view, meaning representing fairly, proportionately, and, as far as possible, without bias, all public views that have been published by reliable sources on the safety topic.
- Outcomes Outcomes are clearly stated results for Josephine County (JO CO) citizens and stakeholders who are supposed to benefit.
- Safety Program The JO CO's present public safety program has the following separate funding components: 1. adult jail beds, 2. juvenile justice center, 3. district attorney's office, 4. court services, 5. rural patrol deputies, 6. criminal investigations & related sheriff's office support services, and 7. animal protection.
- Stakeholder A stakeholder is anyone affected by, or with an interest in, the JS&PSS Issue.
- *Study* The *Study* is a socio-economic impact study that will document a comparison of the publicly identified range of alternative solutions for the JS&PSS Issue. The *Study* components include the following: 1. the publicly identified issues, range of alternative solutions, and affected conditions; and 2. analyzing the impacts of each alternative evaluated by condition indicators and standards through a combination of citizen input and professional expert investigations.
- *Study Design* The *Justice System & Public Safety Services Study Design: 2015 (Study Design)* sets the design parameters for the impact *Study* project which will document a comparison of the publicly identified range of alternative solutions for the JS&PSS Issue.
- Vetted Facts In an independent neutral planning analysis, facts/inventories are gathered and vetted, or checked, to determine their accuracy and usefulness.

ARGUMENTS FOR SUPPORTING STUDY DESIGN
for
Justice System & Public Safety Services Study Design: 2015

INTRODUCTION

The subject of *Arguments for Supporting Study Design* is, as the title implies, the reasons the authors believe *Justice System & Public Safety Services Study Design: 2015 (Study Design)* is a good idea. Chapter I addresses the public safety problem/issue. The arguments are the reasons to support a unique decision-making process where the citizens are the decision-makers. The conclusion is what *Study Design* hopes to achieve in the form of solution outcomes. What are outcomes? They simply mean clearly stated results for Josephine County (JO CO) citizens and stakeholders who are supposed to benefit.

1. JO CO's JS&PSS Problem/Issue.
2. Arguments for Supporting *Study Design*.
3. What We Hope to Achieve: Outputs and Outcomes.

I. JOSEPHINE COUNTY'S JUSTICE SYSTEM & PUBLIC SAFETY SERVICES PROBLEM/ISSUE

The topic is information about JO CO's JS&PSS problem/issue (Appendix A - Issues). What are these services and what is the problem? Or, is there a problem, and if so, judged by what standards?

JO CO has been in the 2000 Secure Rural Schools (SRS) and Community Self-Determination Act phase of planning for 15 years from 2000 - 2015. This phase was a temporary program of declining federal payments (Table 2), used for JS&PSS, and based on historical timber harvest revenues, rather than current revenues. Public safety services are generally considered the components of JO CO's historic public safety program: 1. adult jail beds, 2. juvenile justice center, 3. district attorney's office, 4. court services, 5. rural patrol deputies, 6. criminal investigations and related sheriff's office support services, and 7. animal protection.

From 2012 - 2015 there have been four JO CO public safety levies, in as many years, to restore the JS&PSS program to funding approximating historic levels. None of them passed (Table 1). Is crime the problem (i.e., reason for levies?): felonies, misdemeanors, and/or violations? Felony crime includes personal crimes, such as murder, robbery and rape, and crimes against property, including burglary or larceny. Are the potential causes of crime the problem (e.g., medium income, homelessness, poverty, unemployment, economic problems, etc.)? This definition, of potential causes, is part of a larger list of "*Variables Affecting Crime*" identified by the FBI.

Is funding safety services the problem (e.g., property owners revolt, failed levies, mistrust in government, taxes, cumulative costs, income inequality, etc.)? Is the problem the level (i.e., not enough or too much of something) of the safety services (e.g., no response to 911 calls, low rural

patrol presence, not enough adult jail beds, jailed and released, inefficient use of resources, diverted monies, new service levels identified by citizens they are willing to fund, etc.)?

Is the problem a feeling of fear of being a victim of crime versus the knowledge that you can take care of your family if the situation arose?

Is part of the problem because JO CO citizens have never had to understand and debate needed levels and funding for public safety (i.e., JS&PSS). This situation is because historically the JO CO government made the decisions to pass through Federal O & C payments to be used mostly for public safety. The public was never really involved in these decisions. Should this aspect of the JS&PSS Problem/Issue be considered fresh through a public planning process decided de novo, meaning "from the beginning," "afresh," "anew," "beginning again?"

Is the problem a feeling that we have considered all the potential solutions, and tried what we thought were reasonable, only to have them fail, arriving at a point of not knowing how to go forward? *Study Design* has not been tried and failed. It is complex, difficult, and untried. Some ways of working toward a desired solution may be useful or even necessary without being sufficient. In dealing with the JS&PSS Problem/Issue, citizens sometimes forget this simple point. They observe that some action would undeniably help, or it might even be indispensable. Then they present this action as a remedy, without seriously considering whether it alone would be sufficient. But what we want to know is, what means, if any—a single one or a combination of different ones—might be sufficient to meaningfully address the JS&PSS Problem/Issue.

Or, is there a problem, and if so, judged by what standards? Understanding and designing solutions are complicated tasks as there are substantial differences between Oregon counties in terms of their geographic and demographic characteristics, historic crime rates, willingness to tolerate certain levels of crime, and past and present funding of various public safety services. A scientific study of the standards the Governor of Oregon would use to proclaim a public safety fiscal emergency when fiscal conditions compromise JO CO's ability to provide a *minimally adequate level of public safety services* would help answer the "*Is there a problem.*" question (MALPSS; 2013 Oregon House Bill 3453).

In summary, what is the JO CO JS&PSS Problem/Issue? The reduction of federal payments to JO CO since the 2000 SRS Act, especially after 2012, and the failure of four JO CO public safety tax levies (Tables 1 & 2), is real. These are not right or wrong events; they are reality.

II. ARGUMENTS FOR SUPPORTING STUDY DESIGN

Question Why support or sponsor another study that purports to represent the citizens of JO CO, Oregon in their efforts to address the county's JS&PSS Problem/Issue?

Answer: Unique Long-Range Impact Study In a nut shell the proposed *Study's Design* output, a *Study*, is based on formal inventories and an impact methodology model which promotes informed decision-making through a unique long-range planning decision process where the citizens are the decision-makers. The answer is based on several factors: 1. Core Beliefs, 2. Purpose of *Study*, 3. Uniqueness of *Study*, and 4. Citizen Decision-Makers.

1. Core Values Supporting the *Study* is in line with the core values of the Hugo Neighborhood Association & Historical Society (HNA&HS), Committee, and authors of *Study Design*.

- Freedom of speech and the right to vote.
- All citizens, Voters, and Votes Are Legitimate, Pro & Con.

The authors' work on *Study Design* expands on the core values. Collectively they are the foundation for the Committee and authors' interest and volunteer work on the JS&PSS issue.

- Freedom of speech and the right to vote.
- All citizens, Voters, and Votes Are Legitimate, Pro & Con.
- Public is Decision Maker.
- Fair Representation of All Values.
- Neutral Point of View.
- Transparency/Verifiability.
- Public Identified Planning Issues & Alternative Solutions Foundation of JS&PSS Problem/Issue *Study*.

The *Study* is to be researched and written from a neutral point of view, meaning representing fairly, proportionately, and, as far as possible, without bias, all public views that have been published by reliable sources on a topic.

Verifiability is a companion of transparency. It means that people reading the *Study* can check where the information comes from and make their own determination if it is reliable. The Committee's goal is not to try to impose "the truth" on its readers, and does not ask that they trust something just because they read it on the Committee's web page. Its goal is to empower citizens through educational materials that can be checked in order for neighbors to find their own truth.

The importance of verifiability is significant because truth isn't always something as clear and unquestionable as desired. In many cases, such as in topics related to social sciences, there is no "truth" but simply opinions and assumptions. Which is the best political system? Was this or that government a good or bad one? There are very few "true" answers to such questions. There are facts, opinions, facts about opinions and opinions about opinions.

2. Purpose Of Study Make no mistake, understanding the JS&PSS Issue and designing the JS&PSS *Study* are major complicated tasks starting with understanding the values of neighbors. At the heart of a community is a group of people who live in a certain area, and whose common and diverse interests involve the area itself and the people who live there.

The purpose of the proposed JS&PSS *Study* is to provide: 1. grass roots opportunities to county citizens for active citizen involvement (CI), 2. accessibility to information and education, and 3. to better understand the JS&PSS Issue as the decision-makers. Its potential is to address key issues and improve current conditions by recognizing gaps that have emerged between the adversarial pro and con factions through a largely untried and fundamentally different approach to identifying public safety solutions.

Just as important are purposes that are not part of the *Study*. The purpose of the *Study* is NOT to recommend an alternative or a decision for citizens of JO CO and/or county government. It is to identify the public issues, range of alternatives, affected conditions, and the impacts of each alternative evaluated by condition indicators and standards. The *Study* will not have a proposed action, preferred alternative, environmentally preferred alternative, citizen alternative, government alternative, or recommended decision. It will have a range of alternative solutions identified by individual publics for consideration by the collective public.

The identification of the preliminary issues for why the four 2012 - 2015 levies failed has merit in its own right as a standalone summary of the problem as viewed by the majority of county citizens - ***You can't find solutions that last if you don't know the specific problem(s).***

A significant *Study* compliance standard is for the *Study* team to use an impact methodology model. The most important concept of the "impacts methodology" is that it uses the scientific method - it is not rocket science, but the process is logical, and traceable, and is available to the public, agencies, and governments for review. It will also identify the process to determine whether an impact is significant, or not, and the rationale to support the significance determination.

- The *Study Design's* goal is independence of a direct government controlled agenda toward the objectives of credibility addressing all concerns, both those of citizens and government.
- The contract *Study* Team receiving the awarded *Study* will be independent of funders, government, and citizens in the final analysis and conclusions of the *Study*.
- The decision-makers are the voters of the county who will determine how to use the *Study*.

3. Study Process Unique There are significant unique decision-maker differences between the proposed JS&PSS *Study* and the usual major information/impact study. The authors doubt that the proposed JS&PSS *Study* is the only one of its kind. However, it is distinctive and unlike anything in their knowledge base. They feel it is special and certainly unique in modern local county politics (Section II.5). It is also unique in providing a potential solution to the public safety problem/issue.

The *Study Design*'s unique approach to developing the *Study* relies on citizens to provide insight (i.e., public opinion) about how to identify and manage problems, and formulate their own goals and solutions for the future. Some of methods to be used in recording citizens' opinions follow.

- Registered JO CO Voters Voting
- Letters-To-The-Editor in The Grants Pass Daily Courier (TGPDC)
- Guest Opinions in the TGPDC
- News Articles in the TGPDC
- Arguments in the JO CO Voters' Pamphlets.
- Informal Telephone Straw Poll Interviews
- Special Interest Groups' Written Positions
- Public Written Communications (i.e., informal public comments on the evolving *Study Design* and formal public comments on the Analysis of the Public Situation)

This approach emphasizes the importance to citizens of knowing they are being heard, of being the decision-makers that decide their future.

4. Vetted Credible Facts by independent third-party contractors from out of county, perhaps out of state, with no stake in the *Study* results except meeting the standards and criteria for public identification of the issues, alternative solutions, and affected conditions.

Understanding is made more difficult with all those noisy facts when truth isn't always something as clear and unquestionable as desired. The Co-Project Leaders of *Study Design* believe a step in the right direction is for different publics, that don't trust each other, to share vetted, or checked, information. This is one of the purposes of *Study Design* – for more citizens to speak a common language, to solve problems, not to spend valuable time and energy discussing potential conflicting facts.

Although not unique to *Study*, vetted facts will be part of it, as they are part of any reliable impact study. The best impact studies have a professional structure in place for checking or analyzing facts, legal issues, evidence, and arguments. The greater the degree of scrutiny given to these facts, the more reliable the study.

5. Citizen Decision-Makers Grassroots process design is the key. This approach relies on citizens to provide insight about how to identify and manage problems and formulate their own goals and solutions for the future. It emphasizes the importance of citizens being the decision-making body that decides its future. As active participants, people at the grassroots level gain ownership of JS&PSS information processes and become "stakeholder" decision-makers in the solutions.

The *Study* has a goal to put a “human face” on the citizens who ultimately make the decisions and bear the effects of government policies. What are the human values for why the four levies failed? These values are all the citizen voices, including their diverse range of pro and con values and opinions.

The point is that the registered county voters are the decision-makers, and the historic reductions of federal payments’ studies have generally not focused on them and their diverse range of values (i.e., human face of decision-making) influencing decisions and receiving the impacts of those decisions. Values can be defined as broad preferences concerning appropriate courses of action or outcomes. As such, values reflect a person's sense of right and wrong or what "ought" to be - “*Equal rights for all,*” “*Excellence deserves admiration,*” and “*People should be treated with respect and dignity,*” are representative of those values. Values tend to influence attitudes and behavior.

Purposefully the proposed *Study Design* strategy does not include JO CO, Oregon as a potential funder, but does identify it as a potential sponsor. The county needs the *Study*, and it needs JO CO, but the *Study* is not about the government’s identification of the JS&PSS Problem/Issue. It is about representing the diverse range of values and opinions of the public.

- *Study* focuses on the human face of citizens being the decision-makers.
- *Study* is unique in not representing a singular point of view objective, and in representing strictly citizen values.
- *Study* flows from “public” identified issues, affected conditions, alternatives, and impacts. It emphasizes the importance to citizens of knowing they are being heard, of being the decision-makers that decide their future.
- *Study* is non-political; it will not be used in politics in the sense of lobbying for a particular outcome.
- *Study* is independent research and education of neighbors by sharing information publicly through web page publications, and volunteer outreach projects.
- *Study* formally acknowledges the public as the designer of *Study*, and as the decision-maker.
- *Study* has no Analysis of the Management Situation; there will be an Analysis of the Public Situation.
- *Study* results are not a formal government decision selecting an alternative or some combination of alternatives.
- *Study*’s end result is information for informed public decision-making, not a decision by the government.

6. Summary In a nut shell the proposed *Study* is to record the publicly identified issues, range of alternatives, and affected conditions for which the impacts of each alternative are evaluated by condition indicators and standards. The *Study* will be based on formal inventories and an impact methodology model which promotes informed decision-making through a unique decision process, where the citizens are the decision-makers. Many variables provide the rationale for the uniqueness of the long-range planning that will result from *Study Design*, compared to the usual major information or impact study.

The most important variable is *Study Design*’s unique approach to develop the *Study* by relying on citizens to provide insight (i.e., public opinion through registered JO CO voters voting;

letters-to-the-editor, guest opinions, and news articles published in The Grants Pass Daily Courier, etc.) about how to identify and manage problems, and formulate their own goals and solutions (i.e., a range of alternative solutions identified by individual publics for consideration by the collective public) for the future. This approach emphasizes the importance to citizens of knowing they are being heard, of being the decision-makers that decide their future.

One of the purposes of *Study Design* is for citizens to speak a common language, to solve problems, not to spend valuable time and energy discussing potential conflicting facts. A step in the right direction is for different publics, that don't trust each other, to share vetted, or checked, information.

III. WHAT *STUDY DESIGN* IS HOPED TO ACHIEVE

It is difficult when the JO CO citizens are polarized over the public safety problem/issue and have not yet found a consensus solution, and it's compelling that a significant minority of city and county citizens fear for their safety because of decreased number of jail beds, 911 call responses, JO CO rural patrol, etc. How will *Study Design* change the way people live?

What will occur as a result of a successful *Study Design* and the development of the impact *Study*, a largely untried and fundamentally different approach to identifying a public safety solution? How will the situation improve? What the authors know is that *Study Design* is a potential alternative that has not been considered as a serious solution in JO CO. It is beyond the adversary model of pro and con arguments of the last four levies. This chapter focuses on the potential solutions and desired outcomes of *Study Design*.

1. Measuring Success of *Study Design* & *Study* in Outputs and Outcomes Outputs and outcomes are different. Outputs are measures of a program's activities; outcomes are changes that result from the activities. Outputs matter because they lead to outcomes.

- **Program Activities** - A system of services, opportunities, or projects, usually designed to meet a social need (i.e., *Study Design*'s program activities).
- **Outputs** - The amount of something produced by a person, machine, or industry (i.e., *Study Design* products include the Analysis of the Public Situation (APS) and *Study*).
- **Outcomes** - The way a thing turns out; a consequence, result, end result, net result, upshot, aftereffect, aftermath, conclusion, issue, end, end product (i.e., APS and *Study* results for JO CO citizens and stakeholders who are supposed to benefit).

A logic model is a tool used by funders, managers, and evaluators (e.g., authors of *Study Design*, etc.) of programs to evaluate the effectiveness of a program. Logic models are usually the relationships between the resources, activities, outputs and outcomes' elements of a program. While there are many ways in which logic models can be presented, the underlying purpose of constructing a logic model is to assess the causal relationships between the elements of the program: if the resources are available for a program, then the activities can be implemented, and if the activities are implemented successfully, then certain outputs and outcomes can be expected. Logic models are most often used in the evaluation stage of a program.

2. Outputs Are Measures of a Program's Activities *Study Design*'s program activities are ideas, citizen involvement, vetted facts, and the public identification of the problem, potential solutions, and impacts, documented in the program components of *Study Design*. It also includes *Study Design*'s appendices and outreach projects, including the most important activity and output, the impact *Study* - *Josephine County, Oregon's Justice System & Public Safety Services Impact Study*.

The following example of a typical resource impact study, for a polluted river problem, is provided to help understand a public safety program's activities, outputs, and outcomes.

1. **Problem/Need** - there might be a problem of a polluted river and a **need** to clean it up.
2. **Impact** - The mostly likely impact of the river pollution problem is harm to wildlife, and people no longer being able to fish or swim in the river.
3. **Output/Outcome** - A program activity might be an increase in the size of a stream-side vegetative buffer. Measurable outputs are implementation of vegetation buffers: location, size, and timing. An outcome might be the resulting increase in the oyster harvest that occurs because the buffer stops pollutants from reaching the river.
4. **Possible Outcomes** - Some possible outcomes resulting from a river clean up follow.
 - * People will be able to swim in the river.
 - * People will be able to fish and eat their catch.
 - * Boating on the river will be more popular.
 - * A clean river will create momentum for a river front revival.

Outputs matter because they lead to outcomes. Note that in the JS&PSS *Study Design* project, the outputs are the two major units of information scheduled for completion after a grant award – develop and publish the APS and the *Study*. Other example outputs from other studies, independent from *Study*, include the following: 1. a content analysis inventory of public opinion comments, and 2. definition of JO CO's *minimally adequate level of public safety services* (2013 Oregon House Bill 3453). The physical and factual outputs are the information in the studies, but the real output is the opportunity for citizens to educate themselves about the JS&PSS Problem/Issue.

3. **Outcomes** Why is it worth looking at outcomes more closely?

1. Clear results for beneficiaries are often surprisingly neglected in plans for social projects. Instead there may be quite vague aims which hide a good many problems once you try to carry them out;
2. Stating results clearly is trickier than it may look at first; and
3. Once projects are in progress there are so many things to think about that it's easy to lose sight of what it's all for and whether there is steady progress towards results. Establishing outcomes have both intrinsic value in terms of improving practice and external value for communicating with stakeholders.

Outcomes are just as difficult to measure as education of citizens through the information tools of the APS and *Study*. One of the issues identified by the public through public comments is "*Mistrust in Government Growing: Honesty, Transparency and Accountability.*" A big leap in an outcome would be a significant number of citizens not trusting government changing to a significant number of citizens understanding and trusting the *Study*. Nevertheless, that is exactly the aspiration of *Study Design* - An outcome resulting in increased numbers of informed citizens trusting the independence of the *Study Design's* core values, and, therefore, the value of the *Study*.

- Freedom of Speech and the Right to Vote.
- All Citizens, Voters, and Votes Are Legitimate, Pro & Con.
- Public Is Decision Maker.
- Fair Representation of All Values.
- Neutral Point of View.

- Transparency/Verifiability
- Public Identified Planning Issues & Alternative Solutions Foundation of JS&PSS Problem/Issue *Study*.
- More Citizens Speak a Common Language to Solve Problems.

The authors believe an increased number of citizens understanding and trusting the *Study* would significantly contribute to a high probability of moving toward a consensus solution by bridging gaps that have emerged between the current adversarial pro and con fractions. This outcome is very important when comparing it to the current polarization.

4. Key Outcomes Of *Study* The following are some possible key outcomes resulting from a successful *Study*. They are all about the idea of incremental changes, and the authors' confidence that there will be an increase in the number of citizens believing the following.

- * *More* People know they are being listened to.
- * *More* People are better informed.
- * *More* People trust the vetted facts.
- * *More* People understand that the range of problems/issues and range of alternatives were identified by them, individually for consideration by the collective public.
- * *More* People better understand the concerns of their neighbors.
- * *More* People speak a common language to solve problems.
- * *More* People agree on a consensus public safety problem/issue.
- * *More* People agree on a consensus public safety solution.
- * *More* People have a consensus to also address the causes of problem/issue.
- * *More* People beyond JO CO could benefit as *Study Design's* precedence establishes itself as a prototype model for addressing issues that could be used by other Oregon counties.

At this stage of *Study Design*, part of its public outreach strategy is to work with stakeholders concerned with the JS&PSS Problem/Issue in explaining *Study Design* and developing a consensus definition of the problem/issue, including two or three key outcomes.

5. Realistic and Achievable Outcomes The projected outcomes must be realistic, achievable, and developed within the context that some public mistrust in government and others' facts will probably exist in JO CO for the long-term. Contributing factors for this lack of trust situation include, but are not limited to the following: diminishment of neutral news; public fractured in how it digests information; the values' spectrums of MSNBC at one end and Fox News at the other, and the many others in between; and a variety of highly politicized talk-show host radio stations where any kind of movement in the direction of moderation seems like betrayal.

The authors believe that building trust and acceptance of independently vetted facts by the public is a long-term project, made in many baby steps. Developing public trust to an acceptable level in three - five years is probably impossible. What is realistic for our situation? The authors of *Study Design* do not know; they have no crystal ball.

Their gut is that accomplishing the key outcomes of the *Study* will start to show in 5 - 10 years, or more. This is a problem because the unknown outcomes promise too little in the short-term, and the project may not appear cost-effective to the funder and the stakeholders.

In a way, this is the classic example of a strong effective resource manager not being acknowledged for 10 struggling years of excellent work in securing vetted facts (e.g., meaningful inventories available to public and specialists, effective monitoring programs in place, etc.). What usually happens is that managers do not get rewarded for their effective long-range planning projects as the cycle is too long, and they will have probably moved on to other career opportunities out-of-area before the work shows its fruit (i.e., future managers get the acknowledgment for their predecessors work).

This is part of the problem that JO CO and the State of Oregon have had with implementing long-range planning. They know they need to plan – Since 2000, and the Secure Rural Schools (SRS) and Community Self-Determination Act, Congress had repeatedly sent messages that federal payments would be phased out, and this was intended to give O & C counties *time to plan for the change*. However, each extension of the SRS Act, in and of itself, appears to preclude the long-range planning need and, if funded, completed in time for the next deadline. For example, if JO CO had starting an expensive plan, in the beginning, right after 2000, the JO CO Board of County Commissioners' (BCC) planning decision might have been deemed premature, or a strategy of avoiding making decisions by planning, or a waste of funds. The same result could have happened after each short-term extension when planning probably would not be completed in time. However, with the benefit of hindsight, 15 years have now passed without a plan to deal with the expiration of SRS funds, now with another extension to 2017.

The authors don't know if the outcomes are realistic and achievable. They believe they are. What if *Study Design* was wildly successful beyond the authors' hopes for a "More" informed public? Its all about the idea of incremental changes, and that there will be an increase in the number of informed citizens believing in a consensus future.

6. Measurements & Records The goal should be to measure outputs of what is hoped to be achieved and when they will be achieved. The authors are developing ways to measure the projected outputs and possible outcomes. The key outcomes of the *Study* (Section III.4.) are difficult to measure, especially when there are few scientific baseline inventories (e.g., better informed, trust, understanding, consensus, better decisions, address causes, etc.) from which to understand and measure changes. In effect, we don't have the measurements; we do have a positive research goal and direction.

Perhaps the stakeholders could agreed with something like the following measurement at the stage of the final *Study Design*.

“The majority of citizen comments on the *Study Design*, are positive in terms of believing in the transparency and openness of the process, and hoping the accountability of public comments becoming, as advertized in *Study Design*, the developed issues and alternative solutions of the Analysis of the Public Situation (APS) and the *Study*.”

The ultimate goal is that stakeholders will agreed with something like the following measurement at the completion and publication of the final *Study*.

“The majority of citizen comments on the *Study Design*, *APS*, and *Study*, are positive in terms of believing in the honesty of the authors, the transparency and openness of the process, trust in *Study Design*, and accountability of public comments becoming, as advertized in *Study Design*, the developed issues and alternative solutions of the *APS* and *Study*.”

IV. AUTHORS

Mike & Jon, Authors

Justice System & Public Safety Services Study Design: 2015



October 31, 2015

Mike Walker, Chair

JS&PSS Exploratory Committee

Hugo Neighborhood Association & Historical Society

P.O. Box 1318

Merlin, Oregon 97532

541-471-8271

Email: hugo@jeffnet.org

Web Page: <http://www.hugoneighborhood.org/justicesystemexploratorycommittee.htm>



October 31, 2015

Jon Whalen, Member

JS&PSS Exploratory Committee

Hugo Neighborhood Association & Historical Society

326 NE Josephine Street

Grants Pass, Oregon 97526

541-476-1595

Email: bear46@charter.net

Web Page: <http://www.hugoneighborhood.org/justicesystemexploratorycommittee.htm>

TABLES AND APPENDICES

TABLES

- Table 1. Josephine County, Oregon Levy Votes
Table 2. JO CO Federal Payments History: 2000 - 2012

APPENDICES

- Appendix A. *Justice System & Public Safety Services Study Design: 2015*
Appendix B. Summary Highlights: Arguments for Supporting Study Design

TABLES

Table 1. Josephine County, Oregon Levy¹ Votes						
Levy ²	Voters ³	Votes ⁴		Percentages ⁵		Points ⁶
(year and #)		Yes	No	Yes	No	
2012: 17 - 43	49,561	10,901	14,504	57	43	14
2013: 17 - 49	50,944	12,883	13,448	51	49	2
2014: 17 - 59	50,655	13,291	14,700	48	53	5
2015: 17 - 66	51,143	11,868	13,956	54	46	8

Footnotes: 1. Justice system & public safety service levies, 2. Year of levy, 3. Registered voters in Josephine County, Oregon, 4. Number of registered voters voting yes or no, 5. Percentage of voters voting yes or no., and 6. Percentage point spread for voters voting yes or no. The source is Josephine County Clerk, Josephine County, Oregon. <http://www.co.josephine.or.us/Page.asp?NavID=754>.

More footnote 2: May 15, 2012 JO CO-wide Primary Election Measure 17 - 43, May 21, 2013 JO CO-wide Special Election Measure 17 - 49, May 20, 2014 JO CO-wide Primary Election Measure 17 - 59, and May 19, 2015 JO CO-wide Special Election Measure 17-66.

Table 2. JO CO Federal Payments History: 2000 - 2012¹

	SRS Payments	NFS Payments
2000	\$12,524,049.92	
2001	\$12,723,541.55	
2002	\$12,393,868.10	
2003	\$12,554,988.38	
2004	\$12,843,753.12	
2005	\$13,885,138.51	
2006	\$14,023,989.89	
2007	\$13,995,208.93	
2008	\$12,621,591	\$2,756,526
2009	\$11,359,432	\$2,480,873
2010	\$10,237,513	\$2,235,849
2011	\$5,777,421	\$1,654,373
2012	\$5,488,568	\$1,589,434

Footnote 1. Chapter V, *Study Design*.

Appendix A. Justice System & Public Safety Services Study Design: 2015
Web Page: <http://www.hugoneighborhood.org/justicesystemexploratorycommittee.htm>

- **Justice System & Public Safety Services Study Design: 2015** (draft, 140 pages)
 - **Public Outreach** (Draft documents being developed: expect many changes)
 - Outreach 1. Arguments For Supporting Study Design (draft, 4 pages)
 - Outreach 2. Interested In Becoming Involved? (draft, 3 pages)
 - Outreach 3. Publicly Identified Problems/Issues (draft, 13 pages; expect many changes)
 - Outreach 4. Publicly Identified Range of Alternative Solutions (draft, 8 pages; expect many changes)
 - Outreach 5. Equal Public Safety Facts (Not started)
 - Outreach 6. Study Design's Planning Horizon Is Flexible (Not started)
 - Outreach 7. Table Talk Discussion Script (Not started)
 - Outreach 8. How To Communicate In Plain Language (Just started)
 - Outreach 9. JS&PSS Issue Overview Educational Brochure (Not started)
 - Outreach 10. Aspiration Letter From Authors Of Study Design (draft, 4 pages, expect many changes)
 - Outreach 11. Enquiry Stakeholder Letters/Emails (Ongoing)
 - **Appendices To Study Design**
 - **Appendix A. Issues** (draft, 154 pages)
 - Appendix A1. Being Heard (draft, 4 pages)
 - Appendix A2. All Values Are Legitimate (draft, 3 pages)
 - Appendix A3. Measures Representing Public Opinion (draft, 36 pages)
 - Appendix A3.1. Letters To The Editor As A Measure of Crime Salience
 - Appendix A3.2. Content Analysis For Public Opinion
 - **Other Information Appendices** (documents being developed and/or not started yet)
 - Appendix B. Affected (draft, 49 pages)
 - Appendix B1. Potential Affected Conditions (draft, 79 pages)
 - Appendix B2. Studies & Information (draft, 89 pages)
 - Appendix B3. Analysis of Public Situation (draft, 39 pages)
 - Appendix C. Alternatives (Not started)
 - Appendix D. Procedural Requirements, *NEPA Design Group's Comments on the Hellgate RAMP/DEIS* (draft, 53 pages)
 - Appendix DD1. Appendix A. Selected Parts Of BLM's National Environmental Policy Act Handbook: H-1790-1
 - Appendix DD2. Appendix B. Selected CEQ Regulations For Implementing The Procedural Provisions of The National Environmental Policy Act
 - Appendix DD3. Appendix C. Selected Portions Of CEQ's 40 Questions
 - Appendix DD4. Appendix D. Evaluation Of Significant Impacts Model And Recommended Impact Methodology
 - Appendix DD5. App. C. NEPA's Significantly, *Scoping Rogue River's Outstandingly Remarkable Values*
 - Appendix D1. Impact Methodology Model (draft, 30 pages)
 - Appendix D2. Conditions, Indicators & Standards (draft, 22 pages)
 - Appendix E. Impacts (Not started)
 - Appendix F. Public (Not started)
 - Appendix F1. Interest Groups (Not started)
 - Appendix F2. Potential Funders, Sponsors, & Sources (draft, 69 pages)
 - Appendix G. How To Write A Grant Proposal (draft)
 - Appendix I. Public Study (Not started)
- **Justice System & Public Safety Services Issue Scope Of Work** (2013 Authority; draft, 41 pages)

Appendix B. Summary Highlights: Arguments for Supporting Study Design

Justice System & Public Safety Services Study Design: 2015 (Study Design)

Web Page: <http://www.hugoneighborhood.org/justicesystemexploratorycommittee.htm>

Question Why support or sponsor another socio-economic study that purports to represent the citizens of Josephine County (JO CO), Oregon in their efforts to address Josephine County's Justice System & Public Safety Services (JS&PSS) problem/issue?

Answer: Unique Long-Range Impact Study In a nut shell *Study Design* proposed a *Study* which will be based on formal inventories and an impact methodology model which promotes informed decision-making through a unique decision process, where the citizens are the decision-makers. As an introduction, Whalen and Walker, Co-Project Leaders of *Study Design*, provide some rationale for the uniqueness of the long-range planning that will result from *Study Design*, compared to the usual major information or impact study.

- *Study* focuses on the human face of citizens being the decision-makers.
- *Study* is unique in not representing a singular point of view objective, and in representing strictly citizen values.
- *Study* flows from “public” identified issues, affected conditions, alternatives, and impacts. It emphasizes the importance to citizens of knowing they are being heard, of being the decision-makers that decide their future.
- *Study* is not associated with any specific proposed funding mechanism (e.g., levy, sales tax, etc.).
- *Study* is limited to investigating, researching, and evaluating the JS&PSS Issue.
- *Study* will not make evaluations of proposals or alternatives as to right or wrong, nor make recommendations to the citizens on how to vote.
- *Study* is non-political; it will not be used in politics in the sense of lobbying for a particular outcome.
- *Study* is independent research and education of neighbors the best it can by sharing information publicly through web page publications, and volunteer outreach projects.
- *Study* has no Analysis of the Management Situation; there will be an Analysis of the Public Situation.
- *Study* results are not a formal government decision selecting an alternative or some combination of alternatives.
- *Study* confirms information for informed public decision-making, not a decision by the government.
- *Study* formally acknowledges the public as the designer of *Study*, and as the decision-maker.

Answer: Vetted Study Facts Understanding is made more difficult with all those noisy facts when truth isn't always something as clear and unquestionable as desired. The Co-Project Leaders of *Study Design* believe a step in the right direction is for different publics, that don't trust each other, to share vetted, or checked, information. This is one of the purposes of *Study*

Design – for citizens to speak a common language, to solve problems, not to spend valuable time and energy discussing potential conflicting facts.

Although not unique to *Study*, vetted facts will be part of it, as they are part of any reliable impact study. The best impact studies have a professional structure in place for checking or analyzing facts, legal issues, evidence, and arguments. The greater the degree of scrutiny given to these facts, the more reliable the study.

Answer: Key Outcomes Of *Study* It is difficult when JO CO citizens are polarized over the public safety problem/issue and have not yet found a consensus solution, but it's more compelling that a significant minority of city and county citizens fear for their safety because of decreased number of jail beds, 911 call responses, JO CO rural patrol, etc. How will *Study Design* change the way people live?

What will occur as a result of a successful *Study Design* and the development of the impact *Study*, a largely untried and fundamentally different approach to identifying a public safety solution? How will the situation improve? What the authors know is that *Study Design* is a potential alternative that has not been considered as a serious solution in JO CO. It is beyond the adversary model of pro and con arguments of the last four levies.

The following are possible key outcomes resulting from a successful *Study*. They are all about the idea of incremental changes, and the confidence that there will be an increase in the number of citizens believing the following.

- * *More People* know they are being listened to.
- * *More People* are better informed.
- * *More People* trust the vetted facts.
- * *More People* understand that the range of public safety problems/issues and range of alternatives were identified by them, individually for consideration by the collective public.
- * *More People* better understand the concerns of their neighbors.
- * *More People* speak a common language to solve problems.
- * *More People* agree on a consensus public safety problem/issue.
- * *More People* agree on a consensus public safety solution.
- * *More People* have a consensus to also address the causes of problem/issue.

At this stage of *Study Design*, part of its public outreach strategy is to work with stakeholders concerned with the JS&PSS Problem/Issue in explaining *Study Design* and developing a consensus definition of the problem/issue, including two or three key outcomes.