

VETTED PUBLIC SAFETY FACTS

**Josephine County's Justice System &
Public Safety Services Problem/Issue Vetted Public Safety Facts**

*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

VETTED PUBLIC SAFETY FACTS

Outline

INTRODUCTION

- I. JUSTICE SYSTEM & PUBLIC SAFETY SERVICES STUDY DESIGN: 2015
 - A. Study Design
 - B. Study Design To Grant Study
 - 1. Purposes
 - 2. Products
 - 3. Process
- II. PUBLICLY IDENTIFIED ISSUES
 - A. Citizen Identified Problems/Issues
 - B. Citizen Identified Alternative Solutions
 - 1. Range of Public Safety Funding and Service Level Alternatives
 - 2. Range of Alternative Types of Public Safety Program Funding
 - C. Affected Condition Facts/Inventories
- III. HISTORICAL TIME FRAME OF JS&PSS ISSUE: 1937 - 2015
- IV. SRS ACT REAUTHORIZED: 2015 - 2017
- V. STUDY DESIGN'S PLANNING HORIZON IS FLEXIBLE: 2015 - 2020
 - A. Current Planning: 2015 - 2020?
 - B. Flexible Planning Period
- VI. PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENTS
 - A. Procedural Requirements For JS&PSS Study Design
 - 1. Logical and Coherent Record
 - 2. Procedural Standards
 - B. Impact Methods
- VII. VETTED PUBLIC SAFETY FACTS
 - A. Introduction
 - B. Neutral Point of View
 - C. Vetted Public Safety Facts
 - 1. Facts Not Researched To Support A Specific Proposal
 - 2. Independent Study Team
 - 3. Vetted Facts/Inventories
 - a) Verifiability Of Inventories
 - b) Third-Party Sources For Inventories
 - c) Identifying Reliable Sources For Inventories
 - d) Vetted Inventories

4. Final Study Product
 5. Potential Grant Funders
 6. Citizen Monitoring: Public Review & Comments
 - a) Study Design
 - b) Analysis Of The Public Situation
 7. Decision-Makers
- D. Summary

VIII. UNRELIABLE FACTS/INVENTORIES

- A. Identified & Tracked
- B. Analyzed For Verifiability & Reliability
- C. Verifiability Issue Examples
 1. Non-Independent Funding/Publishing First-Party Source
 2. Conflicting Facts
- D. Non-Vetted Public Safety Facts
- E. Summary

IX HOPED FOR BENEFITS

- A. Making Informed Decisions & Critical Thinking
- B. Are We Arguing From The Same Facts?*
- C. Do Facts Matter?
- D. Strategies To Combat Misinformation Are Worth Trying
- E. Conclusion

X. AUTHORS

XI. WRITTEN IN PLAIN LANGUAGE

ACRONYMS & ABBREVIATIONS

APPENDICES

- Appendix A. Web References For *Justice System & Public Safety Services Study Design: 2015*
- Appendix B. *About Us - Fact The Facts USA*
- Appendix C. Why Support Another Safety Study?
- Appendix D. Verifiability Web References

The details in Appendices D1 through D4 were adapted by the authors from Wikipedia references. In the interest of the “plain language” goal for public outreach documents, these appendices which support *Vetted Public Safety Facts* (Public Outreach No. 5), will be moved to an appendix supporting *Justice System & Public Safety Services Study Design: 2015*.

- Appendix D1. Verifiability Of Inventories
- Appendix D2. Third-Party Sources For Inventories
- Appendix D3. Identifying Reliable Sources For Inventories
- Appendix D4. Vetted Inventories

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

- Accessible Accessible is an idea about all facts/inventories being available to the public. The accessible idea is that *Study* is about locals, and is available locally (i.e., a limited number of hard copies), and online. It is not a study about some other relevant broader idea (i.e., declining federal O & C revenues in Oregon counties); it is about Josephine County's JS&PSS Issue.
- 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.
- CI Citizen Involvement.
- Committee Hugo JS&PSS Exploratory Committee.
- Grant Proposal Grant proposal writing is time-consuming. You must first clearly describe a specific problem found in your community or area of interest, design a program that will address it, and then describe the program in detail for the grant maker (i.e., funding source). The goal is to end up with a well-conceived proposal that lays out a strategy to address the problem, as well the funding to pay for it.
- Grant Writer Consider Hiring a Professional Writer – While not essential, many organizations prefer to hire an outside consultant to write the proposal. The primary advantage is that the writer is able to devote time to the project, which you might not have. A consultant with expertise in a particular grant program can assure that you address all of the often complex regulatory requirements.
- 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.
- ID Interdisciplinary (ID) is an important policy that promotes systematic, interdisciplinary analysis of socio-economic issues related to the JS&PSS Issue.
- Interdisciplinary Team The contracted independent Interdisciplinary *Study* Team is composed of team members representing disciplines associated with the socio-economic conditions of the JS&PSS Issue, and identified in *Study Design*. These independent first and third-party researchers are responsible for developing the issues, alternatives, affected conditions, and impacts in the *Study*.
- 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.

- O&C Act Oregon & California Railroad Lands Act of 1937 (O&C Act) covers 2.6 million acres of timberland in Western Oregon. Act of August 28, 1937, ch. 876 (also known as the McNary Act), 50 Stat. 874; 43 U.S.C. §§1181a-1181j.
- RFP A request for proposal (RFP) is a solicitation, often made through a bidding process, by an agency or company interested in procurement of a commodity, service or valuable asset, to potential suppliers to submit business proposals. The RFP presents preliminary requirements for the commodity or service, and may dictate to varying degrees the exact structure and format of the supplier's response.
- RFQ A request for quotation (RFQ) is used when the vendor may simply be looking for a price quote, and a request for information (RFI), where the customer needs more information from vendors before submitting an RFP. An RFI is typically followed by an RFP.
- 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.
- SRS Secure Rural Schools (SRS) and Community Self-Determination Act (SRS Act; P.L. 106-393).
- Stakeholder A stakeholder is anyone affected by, or with an interest in, the JS&PSS Issue.
- *Study* The *Study* is an 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.
- Third Party A third-party source is one that is entirely independent of the subject (i.e., facts/inventories) being covered (e.g., a news reporter covering a story in which they are not involved except in their capacity as a reporter, etc.). A third-party source is not affiliated with the event/project, not paid by the people who are involved, and not otherwise likely to have a conflict of interest or significant bias related to the subject facts/inventories.
- Truth Understanding is made more difficult with all those noisy facts when 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.
- Vetted Facts In an independent neutral planning analysis, facts/inventories are gathered and vetted, or checked, to determine their accuracy and usefulness.

VETTED PUBLIC SAFETY FACTS

Introduction

The authors believe in the importance of a knowledgeable public for a successful democracy. Mom, and Pop, and apple pie, right? Who would knowingly disagree?

The Hugo Justice System & Public Safety Services (JS&PSS) Exploratory Committee has been trying to understand the Josephine County's (JO CO's) public safety issue since 2013 (Chpt. III; Appendix A), and it has been developing an educational safety impact study program ever since. For example, some of the Exploratory Committee's core beliefs are that all citizens, voters, and votes are legitimate. Our 2015 JS&PSS *Study Design* project to develop a JS&PSS impact *Study* flows from this center. The results will be a *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.

Understanding JO CO's JS&PSS problem/issue, identifying alternative solutions, and assessing impacts of the alternatives are complicated tasks as there are substantial differences between Oregon counties in terms of their geographic and demographic characteristics, priorities, historic crime rates, willingness to tolerate certain levels of crime, and past and present funding of various public safety services.

"Everyone is entitled to their own opinion, but not to their own facts."

Daniel Patrick Moynihan

Understanding is made more difficult with all those noisy facts when 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. There are facts, opinions, facts about opinions and opinions about opinions. In most controversies there are more than truths and lies under the sun: there are half-truths, lack of context, words with double or unclear meaning, logical fallacies, cherry-picked pieces of information to lead the reader to a predetermined conclusion, inadvertent reuse of someone else's falsehoods, and straight misunderstandings.

The authors believe a step in the right direction is for different publics that don't necessarily trust each other to share vetted information. Part of the purpose of *Study Design* is for citizens to speak a common language.

- *The first step in solving our common problems is to discuss them together.*
- *Even people who strongly disagree can make sound decisions if they sit down and talk.*
- *Everyday people from different parties can have civil, respectful conversations about politics.*

We believe our *Study Design* project will provide vetted public safety facts through its impact *Study* to help us speak a common “facts” language. Speaking a common “facts” language has advantages. Just one language can create mutual support within a group to pursue common interests and goals. For example, people can share and debate ideas, build opinions, create understanding, and come up with plans of actions to develop a better future of the world. A common facts language can help people to better understand problems/ issues and act on them. It can also help resolve conflicts which mainly occur due to misunderstandings and breakdown of communications.

We borrow a quote from *About Us - Face The Facts USA* (Appendix B) because it reflects our common facts language values.

Maybe we're a radical experiment. A fresh source of facts, painstakingly researched and verified, to help citizens make better decisions and drive better conversations.

George Washington University. Downloaded October 17, 2015. *About Us - Face The Facts USA*. A Project of the School of Media & Public Affairs, George Washington University. Washington, D.C.
(<http://www.facethefactsusa.org/about-us-mobile>)

A personal author short story about communicating follows. During 1975 - 1979 Mike Walker, Co-author of *Study Design*, was a Community Planner with the Alaska Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) Office in Anchorage, Alaska. One of his significant responsibilities was grant writer and project inspector for a multi-million dollar socio-economic studies program. In 1976 he found a plaque relating to his job that has been traveling with him for 40-years plus. Today it is hanging in the hallway of his Hugo home.

*“I know you believe you understand what you think I said,
but I am not sure you realize that what you heard is not what I meant.”*

Why does the sentiment on the plaque mean so much to him? In 1975 - 1976 the Alaska OCS Office was gearing up for its first oil and gas lease in the Gulf of Alaska. Trying to figure out the impacts of oil and gas development in the hostile gulf was part of the program. Early consultation with the State of Alaska on the OCS’ socio-economic studies program resulted in a major conference of management and staffers from both Alaska and OCS. It was a full week get-together in Juneau when the comradery of mutual goals and understanding all blew up on the fifth and last day. That was when Alaska realized the multi-million dollar studies program was going to be administered by the Feds not the State. Mike still does not really understand how the misunderstanding occurred. His plaque reminds him to attempt to be explicitly clear when trying to explain a subject, the goal of which sometimes still eludes him.

Anyway, Mike has a personal agenda in supporting an independent neutral planning analysis where facts/inventories are gathered and vetted, or checked, to determine their accuracy and usefulness.

I. JUSTICE SYSTEM & PUBLIC SAFETY SERVICES STUDY DESIGN: 2015

The Hugo Exploratory Committee has been trying to understand the JO CO's JS&PSS problem/Issue since 2013 (*Study Design*; Chpt. III; Appendix A), and it has been developing an educational safety *Study* program ever since.

The *Study Design* sets the parameters for an impact *Study* which 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 (Appendix A).

A. Study Design

Goals are long-term achievements. They're future focused and don't include actual steps to accomplish the goal. The proposed 2015 *Study Design* has two goals. The JS&PSS Exploratory Committee will accomplish Goal One in some form which is to complete the *Study Design*. Goal Two is to secure a grant for a professional independent impact *Study* based on the strategy of Goal One. The Committee feels Goal Two is an optimistic long shot. Its viability might be because of the authors' comprehensive, rigorous, planning details approach to researching and formulating *Study Design* which hopefully will appeal to some elected official, legislator, bureaucratic staffer, or public entity such as the Ford Family Foundation, the Association of Oregon Counties, etc.). In the authors' outreach efforts to explain *Study Design*, they have had the best reception and understanding from academia (e.g., Rogue Community College, Oregon State University's Rural Studies Program, etc.), and from local elected officials.

B. Study Design To Grant Study

Study Design has several purposes and six major products, including the JS&PSS *Study*, for Josephine County, Oregon)

1. Purposes

- Citizen decision-makers identify the publicly identified issues, range of alternative solutions, and affected conditions, not the government.
- Promote informed decision-making by making detailed vetted information concerning significant impacts available to the public.
- A full disclosure document that details the process through which the *Study Design* project was developed, includes a range of alternatives, analysis of the potential impacts resulting from the alternatives, and demonstration of compliance with the law.

2. Products

1. Final JS&PSS *Study Design*.
2. *Study* Grant Proposal
3. Request For Proposals (RFPs) – often called grant announcements.
4. Award of *Study* Grant to Independent Third-Party.
5. Analysis of the Public Situation (APS)
6. Final JS&PSS *Study* – The name of *Study* will be *Justice System & Public Safety Services Study, Josephine County, Oregon*.

“A public opinion poll is no substitute for thought.”

Warren Buffet.

3. Process The study process will be completed in three phases: 1. *Study Design*, 2. Grant Process, and 3. *Study*.

II. PUBLICLY IDENTIFIED ISSUES

The *Study Design* approach 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 (e.g., voting, writing letters to the editor and guest opinions in *The Grants Pass Daily Courier*, writing arguments in voters' pamphlets, etc.). It emphasizes the importance to citizens of knowing they are being heard, of being the decision-makers that decide their future.

- Citizen Identified Problems/Issues
- Citizen Identified Alternative Solutions
 1. Range of Public Safety Funding and Service Level Alternatives
 2. Range of Alternative Types of Taxpayers Funding Public Safety Program
- Affected Condition Facts/Inventories

“Too often we enjoy the comfort of opinion without the discomfort of thought.” John. F. Kennedy.

A. Citizen Identified Problems/Issues (see Appendix A - Issues; Outreach 3. Publicly Identified Problems/Issues)

The citizens' identified problems and solutions are the specific potential research opportunities. For example, *Study Design's* rough content analysis (CA) of letters-to-the-editor identified 11 Public Involvement Consultation and Criteria (PIC&C) issues.

- PIC&C # 1 Public Safety Should Be Paid By Public.
- PIC&C # 2 Mistrust in Government Growing: Honesty, Transparency and Accountability.
- PIC&C # 3 Citizens Feel Their Voices Are Not Being Heard. What Part Of “No” Don’t They Understand?
- PIC&C # 4 Rural Sheriff Patrol Presence Has Not Changed From 2000 - 2015; I Don’t Feel More Unsafe Or More Safe.
- PIC&C # 5 Not Fair That Only Property Owners Pay.
- PIC&C # 6 Opportunities Had Not Occurred To Inform Voters in a Comprehensive Non-Special Interest Fashion: Planning & Business Plan.
- PIC&C # 7 Cumulative Assessments Coordinated By JO CO Assessor Office Unaffordable to Many.
- PIC&C # 8 Promote Economic Development & Education.
- PIC&C # 9 Permanent 58 Cents Per 1,000 JO CO Tax & Current Taxes, Fees, Etc. As Identified By JO CO Assessor’s Office.
- PIC&C # 10 Income & Opportunities Inequality Affects Ability To Pay Taxes, Fees, Etc.
- PIC&C # 11 City and County Residents Should Pay Their Usage Share.

B. Citizen Identified Alternative Solutions (see Appendix A - Issues; Outreach 4. Publicly Identified Range of Alternative Solutions; Appendix E)

1. Range of Public Safety Funding and Service Level Alternatives Rough dollar estimates are identified. Alternatives range from an enhanced alternative greater than the maximum annual average federal SRS payments to an alternative with zero SRS payments.

- Alt Costs of JS&PSS Increase Significantly Above Old Status Quo 2000 level Prior to SRS Alternative (more than \$15 million?)
- Alt Costs of JS&PSS May 15, 2012 Levy Measure 17 - 43 Alternative (costs of JS&PSS \$1.99 per \$1,000 assessed value: \$14 million alternative?)
- Alt Old Status Quo 2000 level Prior to SRS Alternative (costs of JS&PSS would increase back to the approximately \$12 million?)
- Alt May 21, 2013 Levy Measure 17 - 49 Alternative (costs of JS&PSS \$1.48 per \$1,000 Assessed Value: \$10 Million Alternative?)
- Alt 2015 House Joint Resolution 21 Alternative (2015 Session of Oregon Legislature, House Joint Resolution 21, minimum \$2.00 per \$1,000)
- Alt May 19, 2015 Levy Measure 17-66 Alternative (costs of JS&PSS \$1.40 per \$1,000 Assessed Value: Approximately \$9 million - \$10.5 Million Alternative?)
- Alt May 20, 2014 Levy Measure 17 - 59 Alternative (costs of of JS&PSS \$1.19 per \$1,000 Assessed Value: \$8.3 Million Alternative)
- Alt No Action Alternative - Live Within Your Budget Alternative (approximately \$7.6 million?)
- Alt Citizens Can Provide Their Own Protection At Current Funding Alternative (no SRS Federal payments: approximately 3 million dollars?)
- Alt Unknown Timber Program Future Alternative (approximately 5 - ? million dollars?)
- Alt Minimally Adequate Level of Public Safety Services Alternative (apply Oregon House Bill 3453 criteria)
- Alt JO CO Declare Bankruptcy Alternative (future law like OR HB 2924 (2013) - declare bankruptcy)
- Alt State Implements Oregon House Bill (HB) 3453 Alternative
- Alt Sales Tax Alternative
- Alt O&C Revenues: Wyden Bill Alternative
- Alt O&C Revenues: County Take Back O&C Lands Alternative (as lands used to be in private ownership paying taxes)
- Alt O&C Revenues: Tax Equivalent Alternative (Federal government pay JO CO the equivalent of what private rural commercial timber companies presently pay, on a per-acre basis)
- Alt Usage Share Alternative (city and county special taxing districts pay their usage share)
- Alt Address Cause Of Crime (e.g., homelessness, poverty, unemployment, economic problems, etc.)
- Alt Combinations of Alternatives (other combinations of alternatives)

2. Range of Alternative Types of Public Safety Program Funding

- Alt Property Taxes Alternative
- Alt Sales Tax Alternative
- Alt Flat Taxes Alternative
- Alt Volunteer Payments Alternative
- Alt In-County-Only Lottery Alternative
- Alt Mix Of Types of Taxpayers Alternative
- Alt Permanent Tax District(s) Alternative
- Alt O&C Revenues: Wyden Bill Alternative
- Alt O&C Revenues: County Take Back O&C Lands Alternative (as lands used to be in private ownership paying taxes)
- Alt O&C Revenues: Tax Equivalent Alternative (Federal government pay JO CO the equivalent of what private rural commercial timber companies presently pay, on a per-acre basis)

C. **Affected Condition Facts/Inventories** (see Appendix A - Issues; Appendix B1. Potential Affected Conditions)

One of the main purposes of the proposed JS&PSS *Study* grant is to provide grass roots opportunities for JO CO citizens in active citizen involvement (CI) through the design of *Study Design* and *Study*, accessibility to information and education, and to better understand the JS&PSS Issue, which is partially driven by the history of revenue sharing from the federal government. The first important step was the identification of the issues by citizens (Appendices A, A1, & A2).

One of the important next steps is to understand the studies and information available, or to be researched, for the area of interest (i.e., the boundaries of interest are primarily those for Josephine County, Oregon), and to identify the affected conditions. This is a description of the existing conditions to be affected by the range of publicly identified alternatives.

1. Affected Conditions (Appendix B1).
2. Studies and Information Available (Appendix B2).
3. Analysis of Public Situation (APS; Appendix B3).
4. *Study* by Independent *Study* Contractor.

The purpose of Appendix B1 is to identify a list of potential affected conditions identified by the public that probably will sustain impacts from one or more alternatives. It is a good beginning point in determining which potential affected conditions to consider in the *Study Design*, and the future Analysis of the Public Situation (APS) and *Study*.

The purpose of Appendix B2 is to identify potential affected conditions that have already been identified through existing studies and other information available as potential affected conditions.

The purpose of Appendix B3, the APS, is to provide information characterizing the JO CO profile, describe any limitations, and identify alternative opportunities to respond to the identified JS&PSS Issue. Why do we need it? This APS analysis provides the basis for formulating reasonable alternatives based primarily on socio-economic conditions, existing laws, and science, including the types of safety services for maintenance or development.

Independent new analysis by the independent *Study* contractor will probably identify new affected conditions not identified by the public or in existing studies as the list of potential affected conditions are almost certainly not complete in *Study Design*. That is one of the purposes of first, the potential identified conditions in the APS, and last the final conditions in *Study*. Impacts of a proposed JS&PSS program, on JO CO's affected conditions for social norms and networks is known as social capital.

- Economic
- Social
- Political
- Physical
- Natural

III. HISTORICAL TIME FRAME OF JS&PSS ISSUE: 1937 - 2015

The JO CO JS&PSS Issue is partially driven by the history of revenue sharing from the federal government.

1. First Phase of Planning: 1937 - 2000 This phase was about revenues based on timber harvests. The most significant historical revenue sharing method to JO CO was the 1937 O&C Act which established the timber management and revenue distribution scheme to the O&C counties. It lasted over 60 years until 2000, and the Secure Rural Schools (SRS) and Community Self-Determination Act (SRS Act; P.L. 106-393).

2. Second Phase of Planning: 2000 - 2015 JO CO has been in the second phase of planning for 15 years, since the 2000 SRS Act. This phase was a temporary program of declining federal payments based on historical timber harvest revenues, rather than current, revenues. The SRS, which decoupled timber harvests from county revenue, provided direct payment to counties from the federal government in lieu of taxes. The 2000 SRS Act originally expired in 2006, was renewed for one year in 2007, for four more years in 2008, and one more year in 2012, though each renewal was at reduced spending levels (see Chapter V, History in *Study Design* for more information).

The 2012 expiration of federal SRS payments to JO CO, used mostly for public safety services, resulted in four tax levies as solutions. They all failed. However, there is a high probability for another property tax, or other solution, to be on a future ballot. This is reasonable, as public safety services are needed, even though the form and the cost are issues. The final answer is when there is a public consensus on what public safety services are needed, and budget citizens are willing to support.

1. May 15, 2012 JO CO-wide Primary Election Measure 17 - 43, Criminal Justice System Operations Four Year Local Option Tax (i.e., \$1.99 per \$1,000 of assessed value), failed 57 - 43 percent, Voter Turnout - Total 52.59%; 25,405 votes for Measure 17 - 43/ 49,561 registered voters = 51%.
2. May 21, 2013 JO CO-wide Special Election Measure 17 - 49, Criminal Justice and Public Safety Three Year Local Option Tax (i.e., \$1.48 per \$1,000 of assessed value), failed 51 - 49 percent, Voter Turnout - Total 51.97%; 26,331 votes for Measure 17 - 49/ 50,944 registered voters = 52%.
3. May 20, 2014 JO CO-wide Primary Election Measure 17 - 59, Criminal Justice and Public Safety Three Year Local Option Tax (i.e., \$1.19 per \$1,000 of assessed value), failed 53 - 48 percent, Voter Turnout - Total 56.51%; 27,991 votes for Measure 17 - 59/ 50,655 registered voters = 55%.
4. May 19, 2015 JO CO-wide Special Election Measure 17-66, For Patrol, Jail, Shelter of Abused Youth; Five Year Levy (i.e., \$1.40 per \$1,000 of assessed value), failed 54 - 46 Percent, Voter Turnout - Total 50.65%; 25,824 votes for Measure 17 - 59/ 51,143 registered voters = 51%.

3. Third Phase of Planning: 2015 - 2020? The county is now in the current third phase of planning from 2015 - 2020? There is question mark at the end of the proceeding sentence because we do not assume to know the future. We believe the only constant is the uniqueness of *Study Design*, and the special value of the final *Study* over an even longer period of time (Appendix C).

IV. SRS ACT REAUTHORIZED: 2015 - 2017 (See Chpt V, *Study Design*)

In April 2015, the Secure Rural Schools (SRS) and Community Self-Determination Act was reauthorized, and the JO CO public safety services will continue to operate at a funded level that is a combination of federal payments and local timber harvest revenues. Then, two years down the road when federal payments are scheduled to end again, the voters will have to decide whether what they have meets their needs, or they may desire to consider other available alternatives.

“Opinion is the exercise of the human will which helps us to make a decision without information.”

John Erskine

An issue is that Congress had repeatedly sent messages that federal payments would be phased out, and this was intended to give counties *time to plan for the change*. The payments had been to eligible counties for 1. loss of property tax revenue, which resulted from an inability to impose taxes on federally owned forest lands, and 2. reduction in the amount of logging planned on federal forest lands. Our aspiration is that the final *Study* product of the *Study Design* project be considered part of this needed planning. It will document a comparison of the publicly identified range of alternative solutions for the JS&PSS Issue (Chpt II).

V. STUDY DESIGN'S PLANNING HORIZON IS FLEXIBLE: 2015 - 2020

A. Current Planning: 2015 - 2020?

Study Design's planning horizon goal is closely tied to the April 2015 SRC Act's two-year reauthorization after which federal payments are scheduled to end again in 2017. At that time the voters will have to decide whether what they have meets their needs, or they may desire to consider other available alternatives.

In the short-term the *Study Design's* time horizon goal is from 6 - 18 months. It is based on the visible tie 2015 SRC Act's two-year reauthorization ending in 2017. The goal is to have several research studies (e.g., content analysis, MALPSS, etc.) completed prior to the final *Study* being awarded.

The long term planning horizon of 2 - 5 years is also based on the visible tie to the 2015 SRC Act's two-year reauthorization, and the potential for future reauthorizations in 2017.

B. Flexible Planning Period

The time frame dialogue for implementing *Study Design* is flexible with its two parts and time horizons. The two parts are: 1. research studies of the JS&PSS issue addressing some needed components of the final *Study* independent of the final impact *Study*, and 2. the final major socio-economic impact *Study* (i.e., incorporates prior independent studies and/or these research projects remain an independent part of *Study Design* not part of the final study). The possible time horizons are short-term, long-term, and future unknown.

VI. PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENTS (Chpt VI, *Study Design*)

A. Procedural Requirements For JS&PSS *Study Design*

This section covers two topics applicable to the proposed JS&PSS *Study Design* and the ultimate JS&PSS *Study*.

- Logical and Coherent Record.
- Procedural Standards.

1. Logical and Coherent Record A crucial requirement is providing a logical and coherent record. Simply stated, adequate information is the goal.

*“The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present.
The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion.
As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew.”*

December 1, 1862 Annual Message to Congress -- Concluding Remarks by Abraham Lincoln.

The goal is researching, writing, and editing from a neutral point of view, meaning representing fairly, proportionately, and, as far as possible, without bias, all of the significant views that have been published by reliable sources on a topic.

2. Procedural Standards The ultimate “*Study Team*” (Chapter XII, *Study Design*) will be primarily using the procedural standards identified in this chapter to develop and evaluate in the Analysis of Public Situation (APS) and JS&PSS *Study* documents (Appendix D1, *Study Design*). One procedural standard which will be cited many times follows; it deals with the public having a complete and objective evaluation of significant impacts. The specific rationale why this standard is met or not meet will be provided for each affection condition and impact.

An impact study is intended to provide the public and decisionmakers with a complete and objective evaluation of significant impacts, both beneficial and adverse, resulting from all reasonable alternatives.

Comments from the public on *Study Design*, all its appendices, and other supporting material are appreciated. The following comment categories would be helpful.

- *Information that would affect the Study Design.*
- *Suggestions for improving or clarifying the issues and range of alternatives.*
- *Possible improvements in the analysis, especially information on affected conditions, condition indicators, and standards.*

Public comments (written or oral) play an integral role in the JS&PSS *Design Study*, APS, and *Study*. Comments on the APS is the first formally advertised opportunity the public will have to formally review and comment on the impact analysis and the identified problem/issue, affected conditions, range of alternatives and impacts. Comments are most appreciated if they: 1. are substantive and relate to inadequacies or inaccuracies in the affected conditions, analysis or methodologies used; 2. identify new impacts or recommend reasonable new alternatives or mitigation measures; or 3. involve substantive disagreements on interpretations of significance.

B. Impact Methods

Impact methodologies are part of the procedural standards, but they are covered as a separate topic because it is imperative that an informed public understand the basis for understanding and judging the reliability of the impact analysis. It is especially important that the public have a clear explanation of the methodology and assumptions when information critical to the analysis was incomplete or unavailable (Appendix D1, *Study Design*).

Note that the numerical carrying capacities are estimates not decisions. These estimates are likely to change over the planning period from *Study Design* to final *Study*, as better information becomes available on the affected conditions, indicators, and thresholds/standards.

The ultimate decision or plan should establish the baseline conditions at the initiation of planning — including a description of any degradation in the budgeted JO CO JS&PSS Program – and proposed alternatives that will be considered to address affected condition.

The baseline “affected conditions” are needed to estimate impacts. Without these baselines there is little basis from which the degree/intensity of existing and future impacts can be measured, and, therefore, minimal information to ensure continued high quality conditions and to eliminate adverse impacts or improve conditions. A thorough assessment that includes baseline descriptions of the affected conditions is needed.

The analysis of impacts must address direct, indirect (i.e., regional), and cumulative impacts on all affected conditions (e.g., social, political, economic, etc.).

VII. VETTED PUBLIC SAFETY FACTS (Very Draft October 11, 2015)

Third party public safety facts are information about publically identified issues, alternative solutions, and affected conditions, from an independent source from the subject (i.e., in this case the JS&PSS Problem/Issue) being covered. In many cases public safety facts are the components of the JO CO public safety program (i.e., 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), or the affected conditions that will be impacted by the range of alternatives (e.g., crime, income inequality, violence, budget, jobs, mistrust in government, rural patrol presence, cumulative costs, jails, public safety services, taxes, etc.).

A. Introduction

Potential affected conditions relate to the issues that will sustain impacts, positive and negative, from one or more of the range of alternatives. Impacts of the range of proposed JS&PSS programs on a communities' affected conditions for social norms and networks is known as social capital (i.e., the network of social connections that exist between people, and their shared values and norms of behavior, which enable and encourage mutually advantageous social cooperation).

- Fiscal
- Social
- Economic
- Political

"It is no crime to be ignorant of economics, which is, after all, a specialized discipline and one that most people consider to be a 'dismal science.'" But it is totally irresponsible to have a loud and vociferous opinions on economic subjects while remaining in this state of ignorance." Murray Rothbard.

For those affected conditions that will potentially sustain impacts from a passed or failed public safety action (e.g., levy, sales tax, etc.), collecting accurate and adequate data on their present status (e.g., location, nature, condition, scope, size, etc.) is critical in determining impacts.

As communities continue to grow, local officials and community members are constantly challenged by the need to balance fiscal, social, economic, and environmental goals. One aspect of this challenge is deciding how much and what types of new development the community can accommodate without compromising the day-to-day quality of life for residents. Socio-economic impact assessment is designed to assist communities in making decisions that promote long-term sustainability, including economic prosperity, a healthy community, and social well-being.

In combination the following category assessments of affected conditions are one way to describe the resident quality of life conditions.

- fiscal impact assessments focus on revenue values.
- social impact assessments focus on social and cultural values.
- economic impact assessments focus on market and non-market values.
- political impact assessments focus on controversies over public questions values.
- environmental impact assessments focus on ecosystem change values.

B. Neutral Point of View

The core philosophies of the Hugo Neighborhood Association & Historical Society (HNA&HS) and of its committee, the Hugo Exploratory Committee are the foundation for their interest and volunteer work on the JS&PSS issue.

- Freedom of speech and the right to vote.
- All citizens, voters, and votes are legitimate.
- Fair Representation.

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.

C. Vetted Party Public Safety Facts

1. Facts Not Researched To Support A Specific Proposal (Appendix C) Third-party public safety facts part of *Study Design* and *Study* are not researched to support a specific proposal (e.g., levy, sales tax, etc.)

- *Study* flows from “public” identified issues, alternatives, affected conditions, 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 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 independent research and education opportunities for neighbors.
- The end result of the *Study* is information for informed public decision-making, not a proposal by some private or public entity supporting a particular proposal, or a decision by the government.
- *Study* is not associated with any specific proposed levy, sales tax, etc.

2. Independent Study Team (See Chpt XII, *Study Design*)

The goal of *Study Design* and *Study* is independence of a direct government controlled agenda toward the objectives of credibility addressing all concerns of citizen identified issues and components of the affected conditions, design of alternatives, and impacts of those alternatives. For the purpose of the proposed JS&PSS Issue, the decision-makers are the voters of JO CO when they vote in the next levy, and/or other tax, fee, assessment, etc. mechanism.

3. Vetted Facts/Inventories

Vetted facts/inventories are information about publically identified affected conditions that will be vetted, or checked out, for accuracy and reliability. “Vetted” facts are part of *Study Design*’s verifiability standard.

Verifiability means that people reading *Study Design* and *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 impose "the truth" on its readers, and does not ask that they trust something just because they read it in Committee documents. Its goal is to empower citizens through educational materials that can be checked in order for neighbors to find their own truth.

Verifiability is closely related to neutral point of view, another core content policy of *Study Design*. It is also significant because truth isn't always something as clear and unquestionable as desired (see Chpt VIII).

The appropriateness of any source depends on the context. The best sources 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 issues, the more reliable the source.

a) Verifiability Of Inventories Verifiability of inventories means that anyone using *Justice System & Public Safety Services Study Design: 2015*, or its contracted *Study* product, can check that the information comes from a reliable source. Its inventories are determined by previously published information and primary research, rather than the beliefs or experiences of its researchers. Even if the researcher is sure something is true, it must be verifiable before it can be used in the *Study*. When reliable sources disagree, the researcher’s standard is to present what the various sources identify, giving each side its due weight, and maintaining a neutral point of view.

All material in the *Study* must be verifiable. All quotations, and any material whose verifiability has been challenged or is likely to be challenged, must include an citation that directly supports the material. The cited source must clearly support the material as presented in the source material. Cite the source clearly and precisely (i.e., specifying page, section, or such divisions as may be appropriate).

What counts as a reliable source in the *Study*? The word "source" three meanings. All three can affect reliability.

1. The type of the work (some examples include a document, an article, or a book).
2. The creator of the work (for example, the writer).
3. The publisher of the work (for example, Oxford University Press).

Useable inventory materials are reliable, first or third-party, primary or secondary published sources with a reputation for fact-checking and accuracy. Source material must have been published, the definition of which for our purposes is “made available to the public in some form.” Unpublished and/or non-accessible documents to the general public are not considered reliable. Use sources that directly support the material presented in an inventory, are appropriate to the claims made, and accessible to the public.

If available, academic and peer-reviewed publications are usually the most reliable sources. Researchers may also use material from reliable non-academic sources, particularly if it appears in respected mainstream publications.

b) Third-Party Sources For Inventories *Study Design's* data for the *Study* will come from reliable primary and secondary studies and first and second-party sources. A third-party source is one that is entirely independent of the subject (i.e., fact/inventory) being covered (e.g., a news reporter covering a story in which they are not involved except in their capacity as a reporter, etc.).

The *Study* itself will be a primary source by a first-party, and a secondary source by a third-party. For example, a significant amount of information in *Study* will be a compilation and synthesis (i.e., secondary source by a third-party) of previous primary studies into the format of a traditional impact study (i.e., components include: 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). Another important part of *Study* will be a primary source by a first-party (i.e., new primary information and analysis).

A **third-party source** is not affiliated with the event, not paid by the people who are involved, and not otherwise likely to have a conflict of interest or significant bias related to the subject facts/inventories.

Every fact/inventory in the *Study* product must be based upon verifiable statements from

multiple first and third-party reliable sources with a reputation for fact-checking and accuracy. A third-party source is one that is entirely independent of the subject being covered. The opposite of a third-party source could be a first-party non-independent source (first-party sources can also be independent). An example of a first-party, non-independent source is the president of an environmental lobby group's report published by that lobby group's communications branch. A third-party source is not affiliated with the event, not paid by the people who are involved, and not otherwise likely to have a conflict of interest or significant bias related to the subject facts/inventories.

This concept is contrasted with the unrelated concept of a secondary source, which is one where the inventories presented are based on some other original material (Appendix B2. Studies & Information). Examples of original primary research relevant to the JS&PSS Issue follow.

- Adams, V., & Gaid D. M. 2008. *Federal Land Management and County Government: 1908-2008 - A Report of the “Changing Federal County Payments Policy and Rural Oregon Counties: Impacts and Options” Project.* Rural Studies Program Working Paper Series. Corvallis, OR.

- Adams, V. March 2009. *Local Government Responses to Fiscal Stress: How do Oregon Counties Compare?*. Rural Studies Program Working Paper Series. Corvallis, OR.
- Association of Oregon Counties. October 1, 2010. *Task Force on Effective and Cost-Efficient Service Provision*. Rep. Nancy Nathanson, Chair.
- Beleiciks, N., & Weber B. (2006). *A Guide to Oregon Community Indicators: Social, Economic and Environmental*. RSP 06-04, Rural Studies Program Working Paper Series. Corvallis, OR.
- Gaid, Dawn Marie, October 2009. *Changing Federal County Payments and Rural Oregon Counties: Analysis of Policy Impacts and Responses from Loss of Secure Rural School Funding in Selected Oregon Counties*. RSP 09-04. (134 pages). OSU's Rural Studies Program. Working Paper Series. Corvallis, OR.
- Sorte, B., Lewin P., & Weber B. February 2009. *Economic Impacts on Oregon Counties of the Termination of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act: An Update*. A Report of the "Changing Federal County Payments Policy and Rural Oregon Counties: Impacts and Options" Project. Corvallis, OR.
- Oregon Secretary of State. May 2012. *Oregon's Counties: 2012 Financial Condition Review*. Report Number 2012-17, Secretary of State Audit Report Kate Brown, Secretary of State Gary Blackmer, Director, Audits Division. Salem, OR.
- Oregon Secretary of State. November 2010. *Oregon Criminal Justice Commission Administrative Overview*. Salem, OR.
- Oregon Governor's Task Force. Final Report January 2009. *Governor's Task Force On Federal Forest Payments And County Services*. Governor Theodore R. Kulongoski. 148 pages. Salem, OR.
- Oregon Governor's Reset Cabinet. June 2010. *Report of the Reset Subcommittee On Pubic Safety*. Salem, OR.
- Oregon Secretary of State. May 2012. *Oregon's Counties: 2012 Financial Condition Review*. Report Number 2012-17, Secretary of State Audit Report Kate Brown, Secretary of State Gary Blackmer, Director, Audits Division. Salem, OR.
- Weber, B., Lewin P., & Sorte B. November 2011. *Economic Impacts on Oregon of the Termination of Secure Rural Schools Payments to Counties: 2011 Update*. A Report of the "Changing Federal County Payments Policy and Rural Oregon Counties: Impacts and Options" Project. Corvallis, OR.

Examples of first-party sources authoring the above original primary research follow.

1. Oregon State University Rural Studies Program.
2. Oregon Governor Kulongoski's Task Force & Subcommittee.
3. Oregon Criminal Justice Commission.
4. Association of Oregon Counties.
5. Oregon Secretary of State.

Secondary does not mean third-party, and primary does not mean non-independent, or affiliated with the subject. Secondary sources are often third-party or independent sources, but they are not always third-party sources.

Although there is technically a small distinction between a third-party source and an independent one, in many places in *Study Design* the terms interchangeably, and most sources that are third-party also happen to be independent.

Without a first-part source, third-party sources are a necessary foundation for any fact/inventory. *Study Design* and *Study* are papers, but they are not a dumping ground for any and all facts and inventories that a researcher considers important or useful. The only facts and inventories included in the *Study* were identified by the public in writing (e.g., Appendix A, Issues, etc.), or they were identified by the researcher as a component of the range of alternatives or the affected conditions.

Part of *Study Design's* neutrality policy means that a researcher cannot rely solely upon his opinion about what topics are important. Everything in *Study* must be verified in reliable sources, including statements about what subjects are important and why. To verify that a subject is important, only a source that is independent of the subject can provide a reliable evaluation. A source too close to the subject will always believe that the subject is important enough to warrant detailed coverage, and relying exclusively upon this source will present a conflict of interest and a threat to a neutral *Study* analysis.

Arguably, an independent and reliable first or third-party is not always objective enough to evaluate a subject. There are many instances of biased coverage by journalists, academics, and critics. Even with peer review and fact-checking, there are instances where otherwise reliable publications report complete falsehoods. *Study Design* does allow researchers to improve on material with their own primary research corrections. Therefore, if a generally reliable source makes a false or biased statement, the hope is that the other ID contract *Study* Team members will have material to refute the problem statement and restore balance. The ID *Study* Team, lead by the Team Leader, will agree or compromise to remove the problem statement, and add any commentary needed.

If multiple reliable publications have discussed a topic, or better still debated a topic, that improves the topic's probability of being covered in *Study Design* and/or *Study*. First, multiple sources that have debated a subject will reliably demonstrate that the subject is worthy of inclusion in *Study*. Second, and equally important, these reliable sources will allow researchers to verify certain facts about the subject that make it significant.

c) Identifying Reliable Sources For Inventories *Study Design*, or its contract *Study* product, should be based on reliable, published sources, making sure that all majority and significant minority views that have appeared in those sources are covered. If no reliable sources can be found on a subject fact or inventory, *Study* should not include the material. Verifiability of inventories requires citations for any material challenged or likely to be challenged, and for all quotations. The policy is strictly applied to all material in the *Study* – without exception.

Facts/Inventories should be based on reliable, third-party, published sources with a reputation for fact-checking and accuracy. Any of the three source meanings (i.e., piece of work itself; creator of the work; and publisher of the work) can affect reliability. Reliable sources, of published materials with a reliable publication process, are authors who are regarded as authoritative in relation to the subject. These qualifications should be demonstrable to other people. This means that we publish the opinions only of reliable authors. Proper sourcing always depends on context; common sense and editorial judgment are an indispensable part of the process.

The term "published" is most commonly associated with text materials, either in traditional printed format, or online. However, audio, video, and multimedia materials that have been recorded, and then broadcast, distributed, or archived by a reputable party may also meet the necessary criteria to be considered reliable sources. Like text sources, media sources must be produced by a reliable third party and be properly cited. Additionally, an archived copy of the media must exist and be

accessible to the public. It is convenient, but by no means necessary, for the archived copy to be accessible via the Internet.

The reliability of a source depends on context. Each source must be carefully weighed to judge whether it is reliable for the statement being made in *Study Design* or *Study* and is an appropriate source for that content. In general, the more people engaged in checking facts, analyzing legal issues, and scrutinizing the writing, the more reliable the publication. Sources should directly support the information as it is presented in *Study Design* or *Study*.

d) Vetted Inventories Vetted inventories is the standard for *Study Design* or *Study*. This is a test used by researchers to decide whether facts/inventories warrant coverage in *Study*.

Information in *Study* must be verifiable; if no reliable first or third-party sources can be found on a topic, then it should not be covered except to explain why it was considered and eliminated. *Study Design's* concept of vetted inventories applies this basic standard to avoid indiscriminate inclusion of facts/inventories. They must be notable, or "worthy of inclusion." Determining vetted inventories does not necessarily depend on things such as fame, importance, or popularity –

“Politics and facts don’t belong in the same room.”

Lee Atwater, Political Consultant

although those may enhance the acceptability of a subject.

Vetted is not a guarantee that a topic will necessarily be handled as a separate, stand-alone

inventory. Researchers/Editors may use their discretion to merge or group two or more related inventories into a single topic. These guidelines only outline how suitable an inventory is for its own inclusion in *Study*. They do not limit the content of an inventory.

If an inventory has received significant coverage in reliable independent sources, it is presumed to be suitable for inclusion in *Study*.

- "Significant coverage" comes from primary sources, and/or addresses the topic directly, in detailed third-party sources. Significant coverage is more than a trivial mention, but it need not be the main topic of the source material.
- "Reliable" means sources need editorial integrity to allow verifiable evaluation of vetted. Sources may encompass published works in all forms and media. Availability of secondary sources covering the subject is a good test for vetted inventories.
- "Sources" can be primary or secondary. There is no fixed number of sources required since sources vary in quality and depth of coverage, but multiple sources are generally expected. Sources do not have to be available online, but they have to be accessible to the public. Multiple publications from the same author or organization are usually regarded as a single source for the purposes of establishing vetted inventories.
- "Independent of the subject" excludes works produced by someone affiliated with the inventories' subject. For example, advertising, press releases, autobiographies, and the subject's website are not considered independent.
- "Presumed" means that significant coverage in reliable sources creates an assumption, not a guarantee, that an inventory should be included in *Study*. A more in-depth discussion might conclude that the topic actually should not be included in *Study*.

The common theme in vetted inventories is that there must be verifiable, objective evidence that the inventory subject has received significant attention from independent sources (i.e., first or second-party) to support a claim of vetted. No subject inventory is automatically or inherently vetted merely because it exists. The evidence must show the subject inventory has gained significant independent coverage or recognition, and that this was not a mere short-term interest, nor a result of promotional activity or indiscriminate publicity, nor is the topic unsuitable for any other reason. Sources of evidence include recognized peer-reviewed publications, credible and authoritative books, reputable media sources, and other reliable sources generally.

Study Design coverage is not a final draft, and a inventory's subject can be vetted if such sources exist, even if they have not been named yet. If it is likely that significant coverage in independent sources can be found for a topic inventory, deletion due to lack of vetted is inappropriate. However, once an article's vettedness has been challenged, merely asserting that unspecified sources exist is seldom persuasive, especially if time passes and actual proof does not surface.

4. Final Study Product (See Chpt XIII of *Study Design*)

The final *Study* product documents a comparison of the publically identified range of alternative solutions for the JS&PSS Issue. This *Study* project will be accomplished by documenting: 1. the publically identified issues, range of JS&PSS 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 analysis.

The contract author of the *Study* will be independent of funders, government, and citizens in the final analysis and conclusions of the study. 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 citizen identified issues, range of JS&PSS alternatives, the affected conditions, and the impacts of each alternative.

5. Potential Grant Funders (See Chpt XIV, *Study Design*)

Again, when the opportunity present itself, the goal is to distance public government involvement from the public as the decision-makers of the Study. If possible, the potential grant funders should not have a stake in the outcome of *Study*.

6. Citizen Monitoring: Public Review & Comments (See Chpt XI, *Study Design*)

a) Study Design To be most effective citizens commenting on the adequacy of any proposed *Study Design*, including appendices, should consider the following types of comments.

1. Inaccuracies and Discrepancies.
2. Adequacy of the Analysis.
3. New Impacts or Alternatives.
4. Disagreement with Some Significance Determinations.

b) Analysis Of The Public Situation There will be a *Study* team response to all formal public comments on the APS. A critical value for the record is that all formal written comments on the APS, if provided in a pdf format to the JSPSS Committee will be web published. The final *Study* will explain how these comments were used in the design of the study.

The focus of the *Study* project is to provide meaningful opportunities for citizens at the front end prior to the *Study* elements becoming invested. This most important first step is the focus - the development of the *Study Design*, and especially the APS. A second important step is a comment period for review of the APS and its adequacy

7. Decision-Makers (See Chpt XV, *Study Design*)

The ultimate basis of all legitimate government is the consent of the governed. That was America's founding principle. One of the cornerstones of the Constitution is that it created a *republican* form of government – one in which all government power ultimately can be traced, directly or indirectly, to decisions made by the people through their chosen representatives. The Constitution was enacted by “We the People” – the first words of the document – and the people are its rightful masters. As Abraham Lincoln would memorably summarize it (in the Gettysburg Address in 1863), the founding fathers created a government “of the people, by the people, and for the people.”

All of us are committed to public safety. None of us want to accept cuts to the system that has been in place while crime in Oregon has dropped to historically low levels. Can we accept the reality of fewer resources and plan for the future? If we plan wisely and face reality, JO CO has a good chance to enjoy safe communities.

Who are the decision-makers? The opportunity is that all qualified residents can be “Decision Makers.” One of the most critical ways that citizens make decisions is through voting. Voting is a formal expression of preference for a candidate for office or for a proposed resolution of an issue. Voting can take place in the context of large-scale national or regional elections or local elections which can be just as critical to important community decisions.

D. Summary

The common theme in vetted inventories is that there must be verifiable, objective evidence that the inventory subject has received significant attention from independent sources to support a claim of vetted. No subject inventory is automatically or inherently vetted merely because it exists. The evidence must show the subject inventory has gained significant independent coverage or recognition.

Potential affected conditions relate to the issues that will sustain impacts, positive and negative, from one or more of the range of alternatives. 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 closely related to neutral point of view, another core content policy of *Study Design*. It is also significant because truth isn't always something as clear and unquestionable as desired.

The best sources 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 issues, the more reliable the source.

Useable inventory materials are reliable, first or third-party, primary or secondary published sources with a reputation for fact-checking and accuracy. Source material must have been published, the definition of which for our purposes is "made available to the public in some form." Unpublished and/or non-accessible documents to the general public are not considered reliable.

Part of *Study Design's* neutrality policy means that a researcher cannot rely solely upon his opinion about what topics are important. Everything in *Study* must be verified in reliable sources, including statements about what subjects are important and why. To verify that a subject is important, only a source that is independent of the subject can provide a reliable evaluation. A source too close to the subject will always believe that the subject is important enough to warrant detailed coverage, and relying exclusively upon this source will present a conflict of interest and a threat to a neutral *Study* analysis.

If multiple reliable publications have discussed a topic, or better still debated a topic, that improves the topic's probability of being covered in *Study Design* and/or *Study*. First, multiple sources that have debated a subject will reliably demonstrate that the subject is worthy of inclusion in *Study*. Second, and equally important, these reliable sources will allow researchers to verify certain facts about the subject that make it significant.

If no reliable sources can be found on a subject fact or inventory, *Study* should not include the material. Verifiability of inventories requires citations for any material challenged or likely to be challenged, and for all quotations.

Each source must be carefully weighed to judge whether it is reliable for the statement being made in *Study Design* or *Study* and is an appropriate source for that content. In general, the more people engaged in checking facts, analyzing legal issues, and scrutinizing the writing, the more reliable the publication. Sources should directly support the information as it is presented in *Study Design* or *Study*.

Vetted inventories is the standard for *Study Design* or *Study*. This is a test used by researchers to decide whether facts/inventories warrant coverage in *Study*.

Information in *Study* must be verifiable; if no reliable first or third-party sources can be found on a topic, then it should not be covered, except to explain why it was considered and eliminated. *Study Design's* concept of vetted inventories applies this basic standard to avoid indiscriminate inclusion of facts/inventories.

Researchers/Editors may use their discretion to merge or group two or more related inventories into a single topic.

The goal is to distance public government involvement from the public as the decision-makers of the Study. The potential grant funders should not have a stake in the outcome of the Study. The contract author of the *Study* will be independent of funders, government, and citizens in the final analysis and conclusions of the study.

There will be a *Study* team response to all formal public comments on the analysis of the public situation (APS). A critical value for the record is that all formal written comments on the APS, if provided in a pdf format to the JSPSS Committee will be web published. The final *Study* will explain how these comments were used in the design of the study, or not.

Vetted facts/inventories are information about publically identified affected conditions that will be vetted, or checked out, for accuracy and reliability. “Vetted” facts are part of *Study Design*’s verifiability standard. Verifiability means that people reading *Study Design* and *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 impose "the truth" on its readers, and does not ask that they trust something just because they read it in Committee documents. Its goal is to empower citizens through educational materials that can be checked in order for neighbors to find their own truth.

VIII. UNRELIABLE FACTS/INVENTORIES

Publically identified facts/inventories, like all facts considered for inclusion in *Study*, must meet the threshold of a reliable affected condition.

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. In most controversies there are more than truths and lies under the sun: there are half-truths, lack of context, words with double or unclear meaning, logical fallacies, cherry-picked pieces of information to lead the reader to a predetermined conclusion, inadvertent reuse of someone else's lies, and misunderstandings. A statement may fail to adequately convey the state of affairs regarding some topic, without that statement being an actual lie. In other cases, accuracy itself is under dispute: a certain question may indeed have a "true" answer, but lack of complete information leads to people supporting a variety of possible answers (Appendix D; Wikipedia: Verifiability, Not Truth).

A. Identified & Tracked

Publically identified issues are identified during the issues stage (e.g., Appendix A, Issues), documented in *Study Design*, and tracked through the final *Study* product. The *Study* will have failed if public comments on the JS&PSS Issues can not be traced from identification through *Study*.

“Learn from yesterday, live for today, hope for tomorrow. The important thing is not to stop questioning.” Albert Einstein

1. Identification (e.g., Appendix A, Issues).
2. *Study Design*.
3. Analysis Of Public Situation.
4. Final *Study*.

B. Analyzed For Verifiability & Reliability

All publically identified facts/inventories that are proposed for use in *Study* will be considered by the independent grant *Study* contractor for verifiability and reliability.

C. Verifiability Issue Examples (CO-AUTHORS MUST APPROVE)

1. Non-Independent Funding/Publishing First-Party Source Any publication put out by an organization in support of, or opposed to, an alternative solution is a legitimate opinion and probably contains the facts, unless proved otherwise. However, the publication is clearly not independent of the subject “alternative solution” that the organization has an interest in opposing or promoting. A local example was a public safety survey by Strategy Research Institute (SRI) paid for by Community United for Safety (CUFS) in support of the 2015 tax levy (i.e., the primary public survey was funded by a first-party non-independent source, CUFS).

The following example news was published about the public safety survey (i.e., sole subject of news, or a mention in the article) in *The Grants Pass Daily Courier* (TGPDC). Grants Pass, OR.

- Hall, Shaun, Reporter. October 26, 2014. *Poll Offers Insight To Failed Public Safety Levies*. The Grants Pass Daily Courier (TGPDC). Grants Pass, OR.
- Widdison, Keven, Editor. October 31, 2014. *Safety Survey A Solid First Step*. TGPDC. Grants Pass, OR.
- Hall, Shaun, Reporter. December 17, 2014. *New Public Safety Levy Effort Underway*. TGPDC. Grants Pass, OR.
- Kingsland, Ruth Longoria, Reporter. January 9, 2015. *Citizens Launch Safety Levy Drive*. TGPDC. Grants Pass, OR.
- McRobbie, Melissa, Reporter. January 21, 2015. *Officials Discuss Levy Options*. TGPDC. Grants Pass, OR.
- TGPDC. February 12, 2015. *Pubic Safety Levy Will Be On May Ballot*. TGPDC. Grants Pass, OR.
- Moore, Jim, Reporter. May 10, 2015. *Pro-Levy Campaign Outspends Opponents*. TGPDC. Grants Pass, OR.

Strategy Research Institute (SRI) is a business that, in part, designs and oversees information for persuasive campaigns. SRI is an authority in campaign development and implementation (i.e., findings from public opinion research conducted by SRI showed that the survey funder could capitalize upon a set of core values held by local voters).

Strategy Research Institute (SRI), an Institute for Consensus Building (<http://www.sri-consulting.org/>). The following are quotes from a SRI Brochure in the SRI Library that describes part of its mission (<http://www.sri-consulting.org/library/library.html>).

SRI designs & oversees information and/or persuasive campaigns SRI is an authority in campaign development and implementation. Indeed, it’s been said that we’ve literally “written the book.” Authored by the Institute’s Chairman, G. Gary Manross, Ph.D., “The Book” is entitled: *The Impact of Theory-Driven Public Opinion Research in Strategic Planning*, N.Y., Carlton Press, 1995.

“The graphic below holds ‘Fawn memories’ for the public agency that commissioned SRI to determine the feasibility of securing 2/3 voter support for a \$225 million tax initiative for the protection of parks, trails, open space, and wild life; while simultaneously saving the local metropolitan zoo from being closed to the general public. Findings from public opinion research conducted by SRI showed that the Agency could capitalize upon a set of core values held by local voters. The payoff? This Agency, and its constituents, are today enjoying the benefits from overwhelming voter support for this tax initiative. This is only one of many examples of how SRI’s highly seasoned and credentialed behavioral scientists and strategic planners are experts at the design and implementation of applied research and consulting tailored to the needs and desires of its Clientele; whether it be Cities, Counties, School Districts, regional government agencies, state agencies, what-have-you. When you want or need reliable (accurate) and valid (truthful) input from any of the many publics you serve, SRI stands ready to help!”

“You predicted that if we followed your recommendations (based upon a scientifically conducted telephone survey) that our bond measure would be approved by 79% of the voters. We followed your recommendations quite closely, and the measure was approved by 78.7% of the voters. Pretty impressive.” Mr. Hal Cronkite, (then) Assistant City Manager City of Berkeley.

The CUFS’ 2014 scientific voter opinion survey was not found on its web site, and there were no references in the record how a copy could be obtained. Therefore, independent observations could not be made by the authors of *Study Design*. For example, besides secondary news articles, the public could not access the survey to independently verify that the tax rate of \$1.40 per \$1,000 of assessed property value matched the voiced needs of JO CO voters with the amount of property taxes they were willing to pay. Because it was, in effect, anonymous; it did not exist and would probably not be useable in the *Study*.

CUFS was also the sponsor of the survey, and was clearly not independent of the safety levy that it had an interest in promoting. To verify that a subject is important, only a source that is independent of the subject can provide a reliable evaluation. A source too close to the subject will usually believe that the subject is important enough to warrant detailed coverage, and relying exclusively upon this source could present a conflict of interest, and a threat to a study’s neutrality.

The authors position on verifiability does not mean that the CUFS’ voter opinion survey was not a reliable (accurate) and valid (truthful) survey. It only means that the opinion survey does not meet the *Study Design’s* standard for verifiability (i.e., the survey would not be useable in the *Study* except with many qualifiers)

2. Conflicting Facts Less direct interests can be harder to see and more subjective to establish. For example, much scientific research is often funded by companies with an interest in the outcome of the experiments, and such research makes its way into peer-reviewed journals. Journals themselves can also have conflicts of interest due to their funding sources. Caution must be used in accepting sources as independent. While the peer-review process ensures greater independence, it does not guarantee independence of a source. This is especially true of controversial topics where there may be a great deal of debate and dissent, even in reliable sources. Other conflicting facts are just that – conflicting (i.e., the source is not necessarily creating facts, only using public sources) and/or the facts are real, but not published.

The controversy of whether crime in JO CO was raising is a public safety issue which has had debate and dissent (see following news articles), even from reliable sources (i.e., Josephine County Alert using the Oregon Annual Uniform Crime Reports, and oral statistics from the JO CO Sheriff’s Office).

- Shaun Hall, Reporter. March 26, 2015. *Group Says Safety Tax Proposal Not Necessary*. The Grants Pass Daily Courier (TGPDC). Grants Pass, OR.
- Jeff Duewel, Reporter. April 23, 2015. *Daniel Says County Crime Has Not Decreased*. TGPDC. Grants Pass, OR.
- Melissa McRobbie, Reporter. April 26, 2015. *Is The Crime Rate Around Here Really Down?* TGPDC. Grants Pass, OR.

- Shaun Hall, Reporter. April 29, 2015. *Anti-Levy Forum Challenges Sheriff's Crime Statistics*. TGPDC. Grants Pass, OR.

The bottom line for the crime increase question seems to be that they have been declining per the Oregon Annual Uniform Crime Reports, but according to the JO CO Sheriff's Office, crime is increasing, but not reported in the crime reports for a variety of reasons.

When there is a potential conflict of interest, identifying the connection between the source and topic is important, such as by saying "A study by X found that Y." Rather than excluding such non-independent sources from a page, it is often best to include them, with mention of how the source is connected to someone with an interest in the topic.

Other real examples from the history of the JS&PSS Issue (Whalen?)?

“Learn from yesterday, live for today, hope for tomorrow. The important thing is not to stop questioning.” Albert Einstein

D. Non-Vetted Public Safety Facts

All publically identified material that meets the vetted facts/inventories standards and criteria will be included in the *Study*, usually in the issues, alternatives, affected conditions, and impacts' sections. Alternative facts and affected condition inventories not meeting the vetted standards will be substantially addressed in *Study* for why they were considered, but eliminated from further consideration, and not included in the *Study*.

E. Summary

Publically identified facts/inventories, like all facts considered for inclusion in *Study*, must meet the threshold of a reliable affected condition. 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.

Publically identified issues are identified during the issues stage, documented in *Study Design*, and tracked through the final *Study* product. The *Study* will have failed if public comments on the JS&PSS Issues can not be traced from identification through *Study*.

All publically identified material that meets the vetted facts/inventories standards and criteria will be included in the *Study*, usually in the issues, alternatives, affected conditions, and impacts' sections. Alternative facts and affected condition inventories not meeting the vetted standards will be substantially addressed in *Study* for why they were considered, but eliminated from further consideration, and not included in the *Study*.

All publically identified facts/inventories that are proposed for use in *Study* will be considered by the independent grant *Study* contractor for verifiability and reliability.

IX. HOPED FOR BENEFITS

Do better facts create, cause, or contribute to better decisions by the public?

Understanding JO CO's JS&PSS problem/issue, identifying alternatives and baseline inventories, and assessing solutions are complicated tasks as there are substantial differences between Oregon counties in terms of their geographic and demographic characteristics, priorities, historic crime rates, willingness to tolerate certain levels of crime, and past and present funding of various public safety services.

Understanding is made more difficult with all those noisy facts when truth isn't always something as clear and unquestionable as desired. The authors believe a step in the right direction is for different publics that don't trust each other to share vetted information. Part of the purpose of *Study Design* is for citizens to speak a common language, to solve problems, not to spend valuable time and energy about conflicting facts.

- *The first step in solving our common problems is to discuss them together.*
- *Even people who strongly disagree can make sound decisions if they sit down and talk.*
- *Everyday people from different parties can have civil, respectful conversations about politics.*

A. Making Informed Decisions & Critical Thinking*

The following quotes are opinions from *Making Informed Decisions & Critical Thinking*.

* JumpStart Productions. 2010; Downloaded October 19, 2015. Making Informed Decisions & Critical Thinking. NOW on PBS. <http://www.pbs.org/now/classroom/lessonplan-07.html>

- *"A public opinion poll is no substitute for thought."* Warren Buffet.
- *"Too often we enjoy the comfort of opinion without the discomfort of thought."* John. F. Kennedy.
- *"Everyone is entitled to their own opinion, but not to their own facts."* Daniel Patrick Moynihan.
- *"The majority have no other reason for their opinions other than that they are in fashion."* Samuel Johnson.
- *"Opinion is the exercise of the human will which helps us to make a decision without information."* John Erskine
- *"It is no crime to be ignorant of economics, which is, after all, a specialized discipline and one that most people consider to be a 'dismal science.'" But it is totally irresponsible to have a loud and vociferous opinions on economic subjects while remaining in this state of ignorance."* Murray Rothbard.

The authors believe facts should come first in JO CO's local debate about the JS&PSS Issue. This is because the fact-to-noise ratio in JO CO is high to so off the charts, depending who you talk to – and facts matter. We believe the *Study Design* project and *Study* will provide vetted public safety facts to help us speak a common language when we discuss or read about the Issue (*About Us - Face The Facts USA*; Appendix B).

A fresh source of facts, painstakingly researched and verified, to help citizens make better decisions and drive better conversations.

A core goal of *Study Design* and *Study* is to recognize that all citizens, voters, and votes are legitimate, and slice through the hyperbole, spin, and slant that gunk up the public safety issues facing JO CO today – and present exhaustively researched and vetted facts in a compelling, easy-to-digest, independent, and neutral way (*About Us - Face The Facts USA*; Appendix B). In an independent neutral planning analysis, facts/inventories are gathered and vetted, or checked, to determine their accuracy and usefulness.

B. Are We Arguing From The Same Facts?*

* Hochschild, Jennifer & Einstein, Levine Katherine. July 21, 2015. *No, We're Not Arguing from the Same Facts. How Can Democracies Make Good Decisions If Citizens Are Misinformed?* The Washington Post. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/monkey-cage/wp/2015/07/21/no-were-not-arguing-from-the-same-facts-how-can-democracies-make-good-decisions-if-citizens-are-misinformed/>

Jennifer L. Hochschild is Henry LaBarre Jayne Professor of Government and Professor of African and African American Studies at Harvard University, and president-elect of the American Political Science Association. Katherine Levine Einstein is assistant professor of political science at Boston University.

“Interconnections among partisanship, misinformation, and mistaken policy preferences is well-known to political science researchers. What has not before been fully explored are politicians’ incentives to tolerate or even encourage false “knowledge.” Consider how misinformation looks from a politician’s vantage point. A misinformed voter who holds concordant policy or political views is in a very stable state. She “knows” something important, she uses this

“I know you believe you understand what you think I said, but I am not sure you realize that what you heard is not what I meant.”

Plaque hanging in Mike Walker’s home.

“knowledge” when she thinks about politics (as a good citizen is supposed to do), she is connected with a compatible political party and leaders, and many friends or members of the group with which she identifies and shares her understanding of how the world works. Furthermore, inertia is powerful,

so a change in political views is always less likely than persistence. To persuade this person to reject false knowledge, change policy views, disagree with friends, agree with former enemies, and perhaps abandon leaders or even a political party, requires an enormous amount of effort and resources. Both of these are inevitably in short supply in a political campaign.” (*Are We Arguing From The Same Facts?*)

“Luckily, there are some responses available to citizens and political leaders who seek to follow Jefferson’s precept and bring our government closer to the democratic ideal. We discuss them in “*Do Facts Matter?*” Strategies to combat misinformation range from education through carefully selected policy options, fact checkers, expert advocacy, and legal decisions. None is fully effective and all may be weak in the face of a stable, gratifying intersection among false information, corresponding policy views, connection with like-minded others, and reinforcing politicians. But for proponents of good democratic governance, they are worth trying (Are We Arguing From The Same Facts?).

C. Do Facts Matter?*

* Hochschild, Jennifer & Einstein, Katherine. 2015. *Do Facts Matter?: Information and Misinformation in American Politics*. Volume 13 in The Julian J. Rothbaum Distinguished Lecture Series. University of Oklahoma Press.

A democracy falters when most of its citizens are uninformed or misinformed, when misinformation affects political decisions and actions, or when political actors foment misinformation – the state of affairs the United States faces today. We will start with Thomas Jefferson’s ideal citizen, who knows and uses correct information to make policy or political choices. What are the consequences if citizens are informed but do not act on their knowledge? More serious, what if they do act, but on incorrect information? (*Do Facts Matter?*).

“Hochschild and Einstein argue persuasively that errors of commission (that is, acting on falsehoods) are even more troublesome than errors of omission. While citizens’ inability or unwillingness to use the facts they know in their political decision making may be frustrating, their acquisition and use of incorrect “knowledge” pose a far greater threat to a democratic political system.” (*Do Facts Matter?*).

Do Facts Matter? looks beyond individual citizens to the role that political elites play in informing, misinforming, and encouraging or discouraging the use of accurate or mistaken information or beliefs. It shows that if a well-informed electorate remains a crucial component of a successful democracy, the deliberate concealment of political facts poses its greatest threat. (*Do Facts Matter?*).

Political theorists and activists insist that the public must be knowledgeable for a democracy to succeed. However, many citizens are ignorant of relevant facts, hold correct information but do not make policy choices that accord with it, or – most importantly, we argue – hold misinformation that is associated with their policy preferences. We explore the dangers to the quality of democratic governance from those who are informed but disengaged and, especially, those who are engaged but use false “knowledge.” (*It Isn't What We Don't Know*).

Jennifer L. Hochschild, Harvard University; Katherine Levine Einstein, Boston University. July 31, 2014. *It Isn't What We Don't Know that Gives Us Trouble, It's What We Know that Ain't So: Misinformation and Democratic Politics*. British Journal of Political Science.

D. Strategies To Combat Misinformation Are Worth Trying

The authors believe a step in the right direction is for different publics that don't necessarily trust each other to share vetted information. Part of the purpose of *Study Design* is for citizens to speak, as much as possible, a common language. Let us break bread over common ideas.

- *The first step in solving our common problems is to discuss them together.*
- *Even people who strongly disagree can make sound decisions if they sit down and talk.*
- *Everyday people from different parties can have civil, respectful conversations about politics.*

In an independent neutral planning analysis, facts/inventories are gathered and vetted, or checked, to determine their accuracy and usefulness.

An important part of *Study Design* and *Study* is the strategy to combat misinformation. The strategies range from education, independent researchers, fact checkers, verifiability, expert advocacy, legal decisions, and vetted public safety facts. It appears none is fully effective and all may be weak in the face of a stable, gratifying intersection among false information, corresponding policy views, connection with like-minded others, and reinforcing politicians.

E. Conclusion

Why is the title of Chapter IX, "*Hoped For Benefits.*" Its simple, belief that the benefits of common accurate facts to better explain the JO CO JS&PSS Issue is worth the effort. For example, the authors believe strategies to combat misinformation are worth trying, within the framework that all citizens, voters, and votes are legitimate. Legitimacy has powerful hopes.

- A feeling of expectation and desire, and belief in citizens, for a certain thing to happen.
- *Study Design* may help to facilitate a consensus solution to the public safety issue.
- There are grounds for believing that something good may happen.
- Hope is belief that the glass is half-full rather than half-empty.

“Learn from yesterday, live for today, hope for tomorrow.
The important thing is not to stop questioning.” Albert Einstein

The authors will continue to try and serve a fresh source of public safety facts, painstakingly 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. Independence, and perseverance, especially the value of endurance determination, are pleasure-pain genes that drives the authors forward.

X. AUTHORS

Mike & Jon, Authors

Justice System & Public Safety Services Study Design: 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/>

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/>

XI. WRITTEN IN PLAIN LANGUAGE

The goal is for the document to be reviewed and edited by the Written in Plain Language Team (i.e., Jon Whalen, Linda Whalen, and Mike Walker).

Jon Whalen, Member

JS&PSS Exploratory Committee, HNA&HS

Linda Whalen, Keep It Simple Consultant

326 NE Josephine Street

Grants Pass, Oregon 97526

541-476-1595

Email: bear46@charter.net

“It isn’t what we don’t know that gives us trouble, it’s what we know that ain’t so.”

As Mark Twain, Satchel Paige, or Will Rogers had variously been reported to have said.

Mike Walker, Chair

JS&PSS Exploratory Committee, HNA&HS

Plain language is language that everyone in your audience can easily understand. It means writing in a way that is easy-to-read, looks good, is organized logically, and is understandable the first time you read it.

What do people mean scientifically, when they say to communicate to the “public,” *You need to use plain language?*

It appears that each individual knows plain language when they read it because, if it is plain language to them, it is their reading level. Therefore, for the purpose of communicating *Study Design* to the “public,” the authors must explain it to the target public audience, or audiences, at their reading level(s).

Stated another way, the authors need to develop a common understanding, and ownership, for the meaning of “plain language,” for their average targeted audience’s reading level (Outreach 8. How To Communicate In Plain Language).

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)
 - **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 Resource Appendices** (Draft 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. Appendix 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. Public Study (Not started)
- ***Justice System & Public Safety Services Issue Scope Of Work*** (2013 Authority; draft, 41 pages)

Appendix B. About Us - Face The Facts USA

A Project of the School of Media & Public Affairs
George Washington University, Washington, D.C.,
<http://www.facethefactsusa.org/about-us-mobile>

Downloaded October 17, 2015

Maybe we're a radical experiment. A fresh source of facts, painstakingly researched and verified, to help citizens make better decisions and drive better conversations.

What do you think? Room for us? We hope so. Face the Facts USA is a nonpartisan, independently-funded initiative, backed by Americans who believe facts should come first in our national debate. We're supported by The George Washington University and based at GW's School of Media and Public Affairs, where faculty and students work with journalists and media professionals to research facts. With complementary attractions, live events, broadcast media and grass roots outreach, we offer information, conversation and thoughtful consideration of public policy issues. We hope we'll re-engage frustrated Americans in the political process. Non-frustrated Americans: you're welcome too.

Why We're Here Because the fact-to-noise ratio in America is so off the charts – and facts matter. Face the Facts USA slices through the hyperbole, spin, and slant that gunk up the biggest issues facing America today – and presents exhaustively researched and vetted facts in a compelling, easy-to-digest way.

What the Goals Are

- Present facts and data in creative ways that crystallize key issues facing America and debunk misconceptions.
- Offer “details on demand” so our users can connect directly with as much source data and as many points of view as they wish
- Engage and connect people and communities; present ways to help people get involved and push for solutions that move America forward

Who's With Us? Face the Facts USA is a project of The George Washington University's Center for Innovative Media at the GW School of Media and Public Affairs. We work with many media, strategic and academic associates including Google, Atlantic Media, the Arizona State University and University of Southern California.

Who Funds This? Initial funding and the original concept for Face the Facts USA has been provided by Ed Scott (edscott.org), founder of a number of nongovernmental organizations including the Center for Global Development. Mr. Scott served as a senior executive in several presidential administrations, co-founded the software company BEA Systems, and has been a leading force in global health and development initiatives.

Additional support has been provided by Omidyar Network's Democracy Fund, through a grant to our associate AmericaSpeaks to support various aspects of Face the Facts USA. Omidyar Network is a philanthropic investment firm dedicated to harnessing the power of markets to create opportunity for people to improve their lives. Omidyar Network invests in and helps scale innovative organizations to catalyze economic and social change.

Face the Facts USA Delivers provocative facts about big issues to help Americans debunk myths, hold better conversations, get involved, and make choices as smarter citizens.

APPENDIX C. WHY SUPPORT ANOTHER SAFETY STUDY?

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

Answer: Unique Long-Range Impact Study In a nut shell the proposed *Study's* 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* 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.

Answer: Vetted 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.

APPENDIX D. VERIFIABILITY WEB REFERENCES

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Verifiability>

In Wikipedia, verifiability means that anyone using the encyclopedia can check that the information comes from a reliable source. Wikipedia does not publish original research. Its content is determined by previously published information rather than the beliefs or experiences of its editors. Even if you're sure something is true, it must be verifiable before you can add it. When reliable sources disagree, present what the various sources say, give each side its due weight, and maintain a neutral point of view.

Wikipedia: Verifiability

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Verifiability>

Wikipedia: Verifiability, Not Truth

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Verifiability,_not_truth

Third-Party Sources

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Third-party_sources

Identifying Reliable Sources

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopediaNotes

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Identifying_reliable_sources

Notability

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Notability>

The above five topics by Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia were used to develop Appendices D1 through D4.

Wikipedia

Verifiability/Verifiability Not Truth

Third-Party Sources

Identifying Reliable Sources

Notability

Vetted Public Safety Facts

Appendix D1. Verifiability Of Inventories

Appendix D2. Third-Party Sources For Inventories

Appendix D3. Identifying Reliable Sources For Inventories

Appendix D4. Vetted Inventories

The details in Appendices D1 through D4 were adapted by the authors from the above Wikipedia references. In the interest of the “plain language” goal for public outreach documents, these appendices which support *Vetted Public Safety Facts* (public Outreach No. 5), will be moved to an appendix supporting *Justice System & Public Safety Services Study Design: 2015*.