

Historical Trail Inventories Must Document Verification And Reliability Of Evidence

Guidelines Proposal to Hugo Emigrant Trails Committee



**Mike Walker, Co-Project Leader
Hugo Emigrant Trails Committee
Hugo Neighborhood Association & Historical Society**

**Mike Walker, Education Chair
*Hugo Neighborhood***

Hugo, Oregon

Draft July 4, 2012

Historical Trail Inventories Must Document Verification And Reliability Of Evidence

Outline

- I. INTRODUCTION
- II. MISSIONS
 - A. HNA&HS Mission
 - B. OCTA Mission
- III. POLICIES
 - A. MET Compliance Standards
 - B. HNA&HS Policy
- IV. OCTA's MAPPING EMIGRANT TRAILS (MET) MANUAL
 - A. General Principles Governing Trail Location & Verification
 - 1. Probability
 - 2. Analogy
 - B. Ranking the Reliability of Evidence Used to Verify Trail Location
 - C. A Mapping, Marking, and Monitoring Program
 - 1. Preservation Training Resources
 - 2. Mapping Software
 - 3. MET Manual
 - 4. Training Briefs
- V. ADEQUATE INFORMATION
 - A. Adequate Information Requires Rigorous Analysis & Documentation
 - 1. Information is Understood.
 - 2. Supporting Arguments Are Made
 - a) Statistics
 - b) Examples
 - c) Expert Opinion
 - 3. Policies and Standard(s) of Review Are Identified
 - a) Policies
 - b) Standards & Criteria
 - 4. Applicable Evidence/Facts Are Provided
 - 5. Neutral Point of View, Verifiability, & Sources
 - a) Neutral Point of View
 - b) Verifiability
 - c) Sources

- B. HETC Principals Of Open Inventory Information
 - 1. Data Must Be Complete
 - 2. Data Must Be Primary
 - 3. Data Must Be Timely
 - 4. Data Must Be Accessible
 - 5. Data Must Be Machine Processable
 - 6. Access Must Be Non-Discriminatory
 - 7. Data Formats Must Be Non-Proprietary
 - 8. Data Must Be License-free

VI. VALUE OF DOCUMENTATION

- A. Documentation – Maximize Team Effectiveness and Extend the Investment
- B. The Value of Documentation
- C. How Can Documentation be Improved
- D. Why Invest in Top Rate Documentation?

VIII. COMPLIANCE WITH ADEQUACY INFORMATION ANALYSIS ELEMENTS OR NOT

- A. Met
- B. Not Met
 - 1. Inventory Action Exceeds its Authority
 - 2. Inventory Evidence is Insufficient
 - 3. Compliance
 - 4. Compliance Standards Not Met

IX. PROPOSED GUIDELINES

- A. Guidelines
- B. Policy

X. CONCLUSION

ACRONYMS & ABBREVIATIONS

APPENDICES

- Appendix A. Evidence Not Mutually Supporting
- Appendix B. Neutral Point Of View & Verifiability

ATTACHMENTS

- Attachment 1. Scientific & MET Manual Methods

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ACRONYMS, ABBREVIATIONS, & TERMS

Analysis Elements	Emigrant trail analysis elements.
Big Ugly	Potential emigrant trail sites that do not have surveys. It usually means the land between the GLO section line surveys.
Chpt.	Chapter
Compliance	Conforming to a rule, such as a specification, policy, standard, or law.
Criteria of Review	A subjective rule that requires the researcher to exercise discretion or interpretation, or to exercise legal judgment, in determining compliance.
DDD	Disclosure, Discussion, & Documentation
DLC	Donation Land Claim
GLO	General Land Office
GPS	Geographic Positioning System
HNAHS	Hugo Neighborhood Association & Historical Society
HNA&HS	Hugo Neighborhood Association & Historical Society
<i>Hugo Neighborhood</i>	Hugo Neighborhood Association & Historical Society
JCHS	Josephine County Historical Society
NWOCTA	Northwest Chapter, Oregon-California Trails Association
MMM Committee	Mapping, Marking, and Monitoring Committee
MB	Megabyte (mega is a multiplier of 1,000,000)
MET	OCTA <i>Mapping Emigrant Trails MET</i> Manual
MET Manual	OCTA <i>Mapping Emigrant Trails MET</i> Manual
MET CS	MET Compliance Standards
NPOV	Neutral Point Of View
OCTA	Oregon-California Trails Association
PDF	Portable Document Format is a file format that has captured all the elements of a printed document as an electronic image that you can view, navigate, print, or forward to someone else.
Standard of Review	An objective standard that requires the researcher to verify the existence or non-existence of certain facts or circumstances by observation or measurement.
Standards	Standards: Emigrant Trail Inventories and Decisions
Standards	Compliance Standards & Criteria
TNP	Terrain Navigator Pro
<i>Trail</i>	Applegate Trail
Verifiability	Verifiability means other researchers and the public can check where the information comes from and make their own determination if the references or sources are reliable.

Historical Trail Inventories Must Document Verification And Reliability Of Evidence

I. INTRODUCTION

The Hugo Emigrant Trails Committee (HETC), Hugo Neighborhood Association & Historical Society (*Hugo Neighborhood*), believes that historical trail inventories must be systematically and comprehensively documented for verification and reliability of evidence. This approach will result in more accurate inventories, and just as important, it will foster credibility and lead to public trust and acceptance.

Toward that goal the HETC combines ideas from HNA&HS's and Oregon-California Trails Association's (OCTA) missions, the MET Manual (i.e, general principles governing trail location and verification, and ranking the reliability of evidence used to verify trail location), OCTA Mapping, Marking, and Monitoring (MMM) program, and its own ideas about adequate information supporting verification and reliability.

II. MISSIONS

A. HNA&HS Mission

The *Hugo Neighborhood* is an informal nonprofit charitable and educational organization of unpaid volunteers with a land use and history mission promoting the social well-being of its neighbors by working to champion Oregon Statewide Goal 1 — Citizen Involvement, and by preserving, protecting, and enhancing the livability and economic viability of its farms, forests, and rural neighbors. The mission of the *Hugo Neighborhood* follows.

- | | |
|-----------------|--|
| <u>Land Use</u> | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Promote Citizen Involvement (Oregon Statewide Goal 1)</i>• <i>Promote Education</i>• <i>Protect Our Farms and Forests (Oregon Statewide Goals 3 & 4)</i>• <i>Protect Our Community's Rural Quality of Life</i> |
| <u>History</u> | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Preserve Our Local History (preserving, documenting, promoting & interpreting)</i>• <i>Promote Education</i>• <i>Promote Analysis of Local Cultural Resources (Oregon Statewide Goal 5 & Josephine County Comprehensive Plan, Goal 7)</i> |

One of the ways the *Hugo Neighborhood* aims to best promote the social welfare of its Hugo neighbors is by collecting, preserving, interpreting, and researching its rich local history, and encouraging neighbor's interest in the history of the Hugo area, in their geographic place, in their community. We know the quality of rural life in Hugo is enhanced through citizen knowledge of its history and the sense of community that a historical perspective facilitates.

One of the ways the *Hugo Neighborhood* aims to best promote the social welfare of its Hugo neighbors is by collecting, preserving, interpreting, and researching its rich local history, and encouraging neighbor's interest in the history of the Hugo area, in their geographic place, in their community.

We believe culture, as one basis for a healthy community, can be an alternative to destructive behavior and a healing force, and that children educated in their history and culture will

contribute to the creative workforce of our evolving technological world. In the end, Hugoites will be able to tell the story of cultural growth and cultural impact. Children will see its impact on their learning.

Families will see the effect of culture through their local participation and use of resources. Community development will see its impact economically and through greater social involvement and especially pride.

B. OCTA Mission (<http://octa-trails.org/about/index.php>)

The Oregon-California Trails Association (a non-profit, 501 (C) (3) Association) is the nation's largest and most influential organization dedicated to the preservation and protection of overland emigrant trails and the emigrant experience (Appendix A).

OCTA members protect the trails to prevent the destruction of trail remnants, graves and other trail-related sites. Members also place markers on the trails and maintain existing markers.

OCTA also encourages the study of the trails through its publications and through the development of classroom materials for teachers. Members also map the trails and collect data for the documentation of overland diaries, newspapers and other materials.

OCTA members protect the trails to prevent the destruction of trail remnants, graves and other trail-related sites. Members also place markers on the trails and maintain existing markers.

The Statement of Purpose for the Association, as adopted by the Board in 1987 and reaffirmed in 1991 as follows.

- To initiate and coordinate activities relating to the identification, preservation, interpretation and improved accessibility of extant rut segments, trail remains, graves and associated historic trail sites, landmarks, artifacts and objects along the overland western historic trails, roads, routes, branches, and cutoffs of the Trans-Mississippi region.
- To prevent further deterioration of the foregoing and to take or pursue whatever measures necessary or advisable to cause more of the same to become accessible or more so to the general public.
- To implement these purposes by acquiring either alone or through or jointly with others – federal, state, local, or private – title to the land or lands on which any of the same is located or a preservation or other easements with regard to the same – by purchase, gift or otherwise – and by cooperating with or initiating, coordinating, and assisting the efforts of such others to do so.
- To publicize and seek public exposure of the goals and activities of the Association so as to create popular awareness of an concern for the necessity of preserving the foregoing.
- To facilitate research projects about the aforesaid and to publish a journal as a forum for scholarly articles adding to the sum of knowledge about the same.

III. POLICIES

A. MET Compliance Standards

Locate and Verify Because the accuracy and reliability of the MET program rest on quality of research, it is important to emphasize the **methods used to locate and verify** emigrant wagon trails (MET Overview, p. 4). Documentary evidence (i.e., trail literature of all types) is the main historical resource available to the trail researcher, therefore, MET participants must have a basic familiarity with the literature of the trails.

Examine and Document All the Relevant Evidence

The MET process provides for the trail researcher to examine and document all the relevant written, cartographic, physical, and artifact evidence. In the best of situations, they

are found to be mutually supporting. It is even more important to examine and document all the relevant evidence when it is not mutually supporting. What is relevant? This author's position is that all evidence from all sources on the issue must be examined and documented, especially any conflicting views of other team members. Part of the glue that holds members of the team together is mutual respect. This can be done in a relatively objective environment where the issue is not right or wrong, but compliance with the MET process.

Because the accuracy and reliability of the MET program rest on quality of research, it is important to emphasize the methods used to locate and verify emigrant wagon trails.

Part of the glue that holds members of the team together is mutual respect. This can be done in a relatively objective environment where the issue is not right or wrong, but compliance with the MET process.

The following are the MET Compliance Standards (CS): Trail Mapping Committee, Office of National Trails Preservation & Oregon-California Trails Association. July 2002, 4th edition. *Mapping Emigrant Trails MET Manual*. Independence, MO.

- MET CS 1. Examine and Document All the Relevant Written, Cartographic, Physical, and Artifact Evidence (MET, p. 5).
- MET CS 2. Evaluate General Principles of Trail Location & Verification (MET, p. 4).
- MET CS 3. Apply Cardinal Rules of Trail Verification for Conformance (MET, p. 5).
- MET CS 3. Rank Reliability of Different Types of Evidence Used to Verify Trail Location (MET, pps. 5 - 8).
- MET CS 4. Evaluate Applicability of Guidelines for Locating Wagon Trails (MET, pps. 8 - 11).
- MET CS 5. Classify Trail Location with the Classification Categories (MET, p. 13 - 16).

B. HNA&HS Policy

The HETC, *Hugo Neighborhood*, has been working on researching, mapping, and documenting the 1846 - 1883 *Trail* in northern Josephine County, Oregon for over a decade. The HETC was formally organized by the HNAHS Board in 2005. Per the 2005 policy, the standards for all emigrant trail inventories and decisions would be documented using the standards of OCTA's *Mapping Emigrant Trails Manual (MET)*. This policy was continued March 2012 when the *Hugo Applegate Trail Marking & Mapping Project Agreement* was finalized and signed by its partners.

Per the 2005 policy, all emigrant trail inventories and decisions would be documented using the standards of the *MET* (i.e., verified analysis and documentation completed prior to wooden *Trail* stakes placed). This policy was formally corroborated and continued by the 2012 *Hugo Applegate Trail Marking & Mapping Project Agreement* (i.e., verified analysis and documentation completed prior to NWOCTA carsonite markers placed).

The HNAHS's policy standards and criteria for compliance with the MET Process follow.

- Trail Mapping Committee, Office of National Trails Preservation & Oregon-California Trails Association. July 2002, 4th edition. *Mapping Emigrant Trails MET Manual*. Independence, MO.
- *Hugo Neighborhood*. May 14, 2005. *Mapping Action Plan For Applegate Trail Program*. Hugo, OR.
- Northwest Chapter, Oregon-California Trails Association (NWOCTA); *Hugo Neighborhood*; and the Josephine County Historical Society (JCHS). March 2012. *Hugo Applegate Trail Marking & Mapping Project Agreement*. Hugo, OR.

Draft HETC Guidelines follow.

- Walker, Mike, Co-Project Leader, HETC; Education Chair, HNAHS. Draft July 4, 2012. *Historical Trail Inventories Must Document Verification And Reliability of Evidence*. Hugo, OR.
- Walker, Mike, Co-Project Leader, HETC; Education Chair, HNAHS. Draft July 4, 2012. *Scientific & MET Manual Methods*. Hugo, OR.

In the short term the HETC and the public are the compliance reviewers for final HETC inventories. Only in a very few instances would the HNAHS Board ever become involved in the business of its committees and subcommittees and reciprocal trust is the common bond (e.g., fiscal concerns, policy compliance issues, etc.). The same is true of the NWOCTA.

IV. MAPPING EMIGRANT TRAILS (MET) MANUAL

The 2005 *Mapping Action Plan* was the *Hugo Neighborhood's* first major policy for its history program. It was authorized by the HNAHS Board. Its major policy was that emigrant trail inventories be supported by documented analyses which was systematic and in compliance with the MET. Some examples of a systematic review follow.

- A systematic review aims to provide an exhaustive summary of current literature relevant to a research question.
- The methodology section of the review will list the databases and citation indexes searched; identified articles are checked against pre-determined criteria for eligibility and relevance.
- A systematic review, both qualitative and quantitative, uses an objective and transparent approach for research synthesis, with the aim of minimizing bias.

OCTA MET Manual. The MET Manual was not quite science, but it was a thoughtful mature analysis process to research, locate, map, and document emigrant trails (Attachment One). A

In the best of all situations, the trail researcher examines all the relevant written, cartographic, physical, and artifact evidence, and finds them mutually supporting.

MET Manual analysis was a *systematic process based on evidence, and on sound, repeatable thought processes*. The MET's analyses methods involved a technical evaluation intended to contribute to more objective decision making. Part of the MET's compliance standards was to examine, *and document all the relevant written,*

cartographic, physical, and artifact evidence with an open mind. Preconceptions that lead to "make things fit" must be avoided.

In the best of all situations, the trail researcher **examines all the relevant written, cartographic, physical, and artifact evidence**, and finds them mutually supporting. What does the researcher do when different kinds of evidence conflict? How does one determine the relative reliability of different types of evidence (*OCTA MET Manual*, Ranking the Reliability of Evidence Used to Verify Trail Location (pages 5 - 8).

Most importantly, the mapper should conduct field investigation and authentication with an open mind. The easy things are readily resolved; the **difficult problems may require additional research and field work** (emphasis added). The mapper should avoid going into the field with preconceptions that lead to "make things fit" especially when they don't seem to square with the evidence. The MET program is open-ended. It is designed to allow for doubts and to provide for corrections and additions as new materials and evidence come to light. History is a matter of building upon what has gone before. It isn't a matter of being "right." **It is more a matter of putting forth what research has indicated has the highest degree of probability** (emphasis added). All mapping endeavors should be considered as the opening of an on-going dialogue. That's the historical process at work (*OCTA MET Manual Conclusion*, page 12).

A. General Principles Governing Trail Location & Verification (page 4, MET)

1. Probability *All too often the exact location of an emigrant trail segment cannot be verified with absolute certainty. In most situations, however, the trail researcher can strive for a higher degree of probability by utilizing all the available evidence and following correct procedures. Verifying the extent to which a trail is an authentic emigrant trail may pose a problem. What appears as an emigrant trail may have originated as a later period of freighting, mining, military, or stage road. In such cases,*

the researcher must determine the degree of probability that the trail in question did in fact originate as an emigrant trail.

2. Analogy *The trail historian can only measure the unknown by what is known through analogy. The location of a possible trail segment can be authenticated only by comparing and contrasting it with what is already known about other verified emigrant trails. These analogous relationships include all types of documentary and physical evidence. Thus, to authenticate newly - located trail segments, the trail researcher must apply the accumulated knowledge gained from previously verified trail segments to similar conditions found on the “newly - discovered” segments.*

B. Ranking the Reliability of Evidence Used to Verify Trail Location

What does the researcher do when different kinds of evidence conflict? How does one determine the relative reliability of different types of evidence?

In the best of all situations, the trail researcher examines all the relevant written, cartographic, physical, and artifact evidence, and finds them mutually supporting. What does the researcher do when different kinds of evidence conflict? How does one determine the relative reliability of different types of evidence (pages 5 - 8, MET)?

- Though it may not apply in all situations, as a general rule the closer in time the evidence is in relation to the trail under investigation [primary source], the more reliable that evidence becomes.
- When adequate diary/journal or physical/artifact evidence is lacking, the researcher must rely heavily on the next best source of evidence, usually later reports or maps, especially GLO plats. In all cases, one must utilize all types of evidence, keeping in mind that the closer the evidence is in time to the period of the trail’s use, the more reliable it becomes.

Though it may not apply in all situations, as a general rule the closer in time the evidence is in relation to the trail under investigation, the more reliable that evidence becomes.

1. Written eyewitness descriptions that locate the trail with reasonable accuracy or exactness.
 2. Written eyewitness descriptions that locate the trail in a general way or direction.
 3. Remaining physical, vegetation, or artifact evidence of wagon trails that correspond to either diary or plat evidence.
 4. General Land Office (GLO) cadastral survey plats.
 5. Topographic features that serve to confine wagon travel can aid interpretation of sketchy diary accounts and GLO plats. However, emigrant trails often defy modern reasoning on the route these trails should have taken. Be cautious, therefore, of second guessing emigrant reasoning and practices.
 6. Reports that describe the location of emigrant trails, such as federal, state, county, territorial, military, and railroad surveys undertaken in the 1850 and later.
 7. Maps that show the location of either emigrant trails or possible emigrant trails.
 8. Recent evidence and documentation.
- Experience has shown that caution must be exercised when using some of the preceding types of evidence and documentation. Even detailed diary account can be misleading or confusing.

- GLO plats, despite their potential for inaccuracies and omissions, are among the most useful and available sources we have for determining the emigrant trail routes.
- Information gleaned from trail buffs, local residents, ranchers, foresters, and government agency people can be quite useful. However, as with any piece of evidence gathered by the trail researcher, it must be rigorously evaluated and verified. Just because someone insists the trail is over here or over there does not make it authoritative. The researcher should be open to but cautious about acceptance of this kind of trail information.

C. Mapping, Marking, and Monitoring (MMM) Program
 (<http://octa-trails.org/preserve/training.php>)

1. Preservation Training Resources - Official OCTA Training Briefings/A Preservation Strategy. This strategy has been developed from the perspective of public partnership organizations who have taken on a stewardship role for an historic trail. It does not reflect the perspectives of the agencies responsible for oversight.

GLO plats, despite their potential for inaccuracies and omissions, are among the most useful and available sources we have for determining the emigrant trail routes.

2. Mapping Software MyTopo, the maker of Terrain Navigator mapping products, is making Terrain Navigator Pro (TNP) available to OCTA members for about \$175 per state. The regular price is \$299. Each state package contains all of the USGS topographic maps in that state for 1:250,000, 1:100,000, and 1:24,000 scales. For an annual subscription fee of \$99 (included in the first year subscription), aerial photographs at 1:12,500 scale are included. For further information go to the MyTopo website: www.mytopo.com.

3. MET Manual

- *MET Manual* (8 MB, 125 pages, PDF, 2002)
- *MET Field Manual* (4 MB, 35 pages, PDF, 1994)
- *Trail Mapping with GPS & Mapping Software* (2 MB, 18 pages, PDF, 2010)

4. Training Briefs

1. Introduction (07-2010)
 2. Trail Monitoring (07-2010)
 3. Mapping Emigrant Trails (07-2010)
 4. Trail Classifications (07-2010)
 5. GPS & Mapping Software (07-2010)
 6. Trail Marking (07-2010)
 7. OCTA Trail Marking Policy (07-2010)
- Preservation Basics (30 MB - PDF) (05-2010)

V. ADEQUATE INFORMATION

When conducting historical trail inventory, the HETC believes that transparency as used in a social context, implies openness, communication, and accountability. Transparency is operating in such a way that it is easy for others to see that trail inventories are verified and to what reliability. Open communication, accountability, and respect is fostered by the scientific method (Attachment One).

The HETC believes transparent inventories are about disclosure, public discussion, and documentation (DDD). At the first level transparency is providing information about an issue, event, project, policy, program, etc., and then providing a way for other researchers and the public to find and view that information.

At the second level the definition of transparency is defined as DDD. After all, these issues, projects, and programs all have to do with the public's interest, and using public money or perhaps others' private money. For example, all trail inventories lead to a trail classification

Transparency is operating in such a way that it is easy for others to see that trail inventories are verified and to what reliability.

category and a recommended management regime that costs money (e.g., vegetation management, analyses and verification, mapping, academic studies, marking, interpretive signage, maintenance, etc.). The following five classification categories for overland emigrant

trails are designed to assess the condition of trails at the time of mapping and establish a basis on which to recommend levels of preservation and use for trails on public lands. The HETC encourages private landowners to consider the recommended levels of preservation and use for trails. The five categories are OCTA's standard classifications for all emigrant trail mapping (MET Manual, pages 13 - 15).

- Class 1 ① Unaltered Trail. It retains its original character. Should Be Preserved (MET Manual, page 13).
- Class 2 ② Used Trail. It retains elements of its original character, but shows use by motor vehicles. Should Be Preserved (MET Manual, page 13).
- Class 3 ③ Verified Trail. It is accurately located and verified, but trail traces are nonexistent or insignificant. Should Be Preserved (MET Manual, page 14).
- Class 4 ④ Altered Trail. It is verified, but elements of its original condition are permanently altered. May be Desirable to Preserve (MET Manual, page 14).
- Class 5 ⑤ Approximate Trail. It is obliterated or unverifiable and its location is known only approximately. No Preservation Recommended (MET Manual, page 14).

The HETC believes that inventory information becomes more valuable as it is shared, and less valuable as it is hoarded. Adequate information is a goal the HETC strives for all its published materials.

The HETC believes that any inventory opinion, for purposes other than therapeutic subjective venting, should meet standards of adequacy to have any credibility. Any opinion purported to be based on analysis must meet standards of adequacy for an inventory decision to be credible. Any significant controversial inventory issue must meet stringent standards of adequacy for the final

inventory decision to be credible, and, therefore, its best opportunity to be accepted and supported by other researchers and the public.

An HETC adequate trail inventory analysis has several elements, a conclusion of adequacy, and published documentation.

- Information Is Understood Or Not
- Supporting Arguments Are Made Or Not
- Policies & Standard(s) of Compliance Have Been Identified Or Not
- Applicable Evidence/Facts Are Available Or Not
- Neutral Point of View Maintained Or Not
- Documented Verifiability Provided Or Not
- References and Sources of Information Were Identified Or Not
- Compliance With Adequacy Information Analysis Elements Or Not

A. Adequate Information Requires Rigorous Analysis & Documentation

An informed citizenry and informed researcher need the facts and, to have and understand, the substantive standards and criteria that apply to an inventory identified by the researcher. The researcher's obligation is to ensure that compliance with all applicable approval standards and criteria is determined and documented (e.g., authentication by HETC and NWOCTA; as needed review by HNAHS, etc.). This will provide an opportunity for other researchers to review the quality of the work, and for public participation. Adequate information requires rigorous analysis and documentation.

An informed citizenry needs to have the researcher explain the thresholds which apply to emigrant trail inventories and state how applicable standards and criteria have been satisfied. This is very important emigrant trail adequacy is often failed to meet by researchers.

Adequate. Enough or satisfactory for a particular purpose.

1. As much or as good as necessary for some requirement or purpose; fully sufficient, suitable, or fit (i.e., This car is adequate to our needs; adequate food for fifty people).
2. Barely sufficient or suitable – Being adequate is not good enough.
3. Law. Reasonably sufficient for starting legal action: adequate grounds.

Synonyms: satisfactory, competent, sufficient, enough; capable.

Adequate information is also the demonstration that the researcher has addressed in writing specific inventory issues relevant to compliance with applicable approval standards and criteria that were raised. For example, where focused testimony raised legitimate concerns about an inventory, or compliance with a relevant approval criterion, the researcher's findings must address such concerns.

An “HETC adequate information analysis” has five analysis elements and a conclusion of adequacy.

- Analysis Element 1. Information is Understood.
- Analysis Element 2. Supporting Arguments Are Made
- Analysis Element 3. Policies & Standard(s) of Compliance Are Identified
- Analysis Element 4. Applicable Evidence/Facts Are Provided
- Analysis Element 5. Neutral Point of View, Verifiability, & Sources

1. Information Is Understood “Understood” is defined as to know the meaning of something or to grasp the situation. There are many different shades of understanding, a few of which follow.

1. To get or perceive the meaning of; know or grasp what is meant by; comprehend: to *understand* a question.
2. To gather or assume from what is heard, known, etc.; infer: are we to *understand* that you want to go?
3. To take as meant or meaning; interpret: to *understand* his silence as refusal.
4. To take for granted or as a fact: it is *understood* that no one is to leave.
5. To supply mentally (an idea, word, etc.), as for grammatical completeness.
6. To get as information; learn.
7. To know thoroughly; grasp or perceive clearly and fully the nature, character, functioning, etc.
8. To have a sympathetic rapport with: no one *understands* me

For the purposes of the HETC, the word “understand” means to get or perceive the meaning of; know or grasp what is meant by; comprehend as to *understand* a question; and specifically to understand a written statement. Understanding a written statement (i.e., word, phrase, sentence, paragraph, page, paper) includes the technical and legal meaning, and if a process, how the process will be applied or implemented.

The emigrant trail researcher is responsible not only for providing a conclusion and/or interpretive opinion to the HETC. She shall also provide a statement, opinion, or conclusion with the PROS (supporting ideas) and CONS (opposing ideas) of an argumentative inventory issue.

2. Supporting Arguments Are Made The emigrant trail researcher is responsible not only for providing a conclusion and/or interpretive opinion to the HETC. She shall also provide a statement, opinion, or conclusion with the PROS (supporting ideas) and CONS (opposing ideas) of an argumentative inventory issue. He clearly takes a stand and writes as if he is trying to persuade an opposing audience to accept new information. The primary objective is to persuade members of HETC or other researcher(s) to change beliefs that, perhaps, many of them do not want to change. For example, a member has been asked to write a paper that advances and supports an inventory action reached. The main point about a topic is identified—the central claim of the paper. What counts as effective support for this claim? Here are three accepted ways to support the argument. They can be used separately or in combination, according to the purpose and audience.

a) Statistics Statistics convey information in numerical form, often referred to as data. Statistics are most accessible and convincing when they are used sparingly and in combination with an explanation of why the numbers are significant. Remember that even though statistics are considered factual, numbers can be presented in different ways to suggest dramatically different

conclusions. Pay attention to any *conflicting information* you find and be sure to provide the full context of statistical data.

b) Examples Appropriate examples can support the researcher's contention that a general statement is true. Not only do they provide specifics and details in support of a claim, but the vivid description they often include helps to capture and retain the reader's attention.

c) Expert Opinion Expert opinions are based on factual evidence but differ from fact in that they are interpretations of fact. For example, an economist determining a fiscal condition may consider the same data set and observation yet offer differing interpretations of this information. The fate of a historical preservation project will ultimately depend on the credibility of the inventory process and the trail classification category with its recommended management regime, and it may depend upon which argument is more convincing. The fact that experts can draw different conclusions from the same information shows that opinions may not be as reliable as facts or personal experience, but they are a useful and common means of supporting an argument. The opinions of experts about the inventory issue before you are valuable both to determine your own perspective and to support your claims.

3. Policies & Standard(s) of Compliance Are Identified The researcher must identify any relevant approval standards (i.e., standards and criteria), and identify the facts which were believed and relied upon by the researcher(s).

The fact that experts can draw different conclusions from the same information shows that opinions may not be as reliable as facts or personal experience, but they are a useful and common means of supporting an argument.

a) Policies Important standards of review are the *Hugo Neighborhood's* emigrant trail inventory, documentation, and compliance policies (Chpt. III). The HETC was formally organized by the HNAHS Board in 2005

through the authority of its *Mapping Action Plan*. Per the 2005 policy, all emigrant trail inventories and decisions would be documented using the standards of OCTA's MET Manual. This policy was formally corroborated and continued by the *Hugo Neighborhood* Board in 2012 when the *Hugo Applegate Trail Marking & Mapping Project Agreement* was finalized and signed by its partners. This is the foundation principal of the HETC carrying out its mission in the winter-wet, mountainous terrain of Southwestern Oregon.

The MET process is for the emigrant trail researcher to examine and document all the relevant written, cartographic, physical, and artifact evidence. In the best of situations, they are found to be mutually supporting. It is even more important to examine and document all the relevant evidence when it is not mutually supporting. What is relevant? This author's position is that all evidence from all sources on the issue must be examined and documented, especially any conflicting views of other team members. Part of the glue that holds members of the team together is mutual respect. This can be done in a relatively objective environment where the issue is not right or wrong, but compliance with the MET Compliance Standards (Section I.D.).

b) Standard(s) And Criteria of Review

STANDARD OF REVIEW An objective standard that requires the researcher to verify the existence or non-existence of certain facts or circumstances by observation or measurement.

CRITERIA OF REVIEW A subjective rule that requires the researcher to exercise discretion or interpretation, or to exercise legal judgment, in determining compliance.

The standards and criteria for review or implementation imply a process in place to take an action. Applicable standards or criteria govern whether an action threshold has been reached. The following list are examples.

- Antiquities Act of 1906
- Historic Sites Act of 1935
- National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended
- National Register of Historic Places Criteria
- National Register Integrity Standards
- Oregon ORSs and OARs
 - Museums
 - Historical Societies
 - Preservation of Historical and Archaeological Properties and Objects
 - Oregon Historic Families Database
 - Oregon Historic Trails
 - Historic Property
 - Historic Preservation Plan
 - Preservation of Property of Historic Significance
 - Oregon Property Management Program for Historic Sites and Properties
 - Archaeological Objects and Sites
- Josephine County Comprehensive Plan Goal 7: Preserve Valuable Limited Resources, Unique Natural Areas and Historic Features
- Josephine County Rural Land Development Code
- HNAHS Policy and Guidelines
 - Mapping Emigrant Trails MET Manual*
 - Mapping Action Plan For Applegate Trail Program.*
 - Hugo Applegate Trail Marking & Mapping Project Agreement*
 - Historical Trail Inventories Must Document Verification And Reliability Of Evidence*

Interpretation *Trail* inventory actions often involve valid evidence both for and against a proposed idea, opinion, or hypothesis.

4. Applicable Evidence/Facts Are Provided The researcher must identify the evidence/facts relied upon to take action. The inventory action must be “supported by substantial evidence in the whole record” that is not controverted, or if controverted, why the controverted evidence is not adequate.

Interpretation *Trail* inventory actions often involve valid evidence both for and against a proposed idea, opinion, or hypothesis. The researcher decides which evidence deserves more weight in these cases. Likewise, evidence may be subject to more than one legitimate interpretation, in which case a reasonable interpretation by the researcher controls.

The researcher has freedom to base her decision on any reliable evidence, even if that evidence has been controverted. However, the researcher cannot rely on unsupported assertions to justify an inventory (i.e., no evidence and/or no documented evidence). Relying on oral explanations is

only viable when waiting on the documented analyses. If conflicting evidence directly conflicts with evidence relied upon to support an inventory, the final inventory should explain why the non-mutually supporting evidence is not adequate.

Controverted: To contest, deny, or take issue with. For example, a claim of reckless driving alleged in a plaintiff's complaint that initiates a lawsuit for negligence is controverted by the statements made in the defendant's answer that he or she was driving at a speed below the speed limit and was observing the rules of the road.

Substantial Evidence In some appeals from decisions of administrative agencies, the courts apply a "substantial evidence" standard of review over the agency's factual findings. Federal courts will look to see whether the administrative law judge's decision was supported by "substantial evidence" or not. Substantial evidence is "more than a mere scintilla. It means such relevant evidence as a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion." Facts usually refer to the usage as a plural noun of fact, an incontrovertible truth.

Substantial evidence is "more than a mere scintilla. It means such relevant evidence as a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion." Facts usually refer to the usage as a plural noun of fact, an incontrovertible truth.

5. Neutral Point of View, Verifiability, & Sources This section relies heavily on *Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia's* content policies for web publishing.

1. Neutral Point of View (NPOV)
2. Verifiability

a) Neutral Point of View Research of the facts or evidence by the HETC is generally to meet its core emigrant trail inventory policies. Researching and editing from a NPOV means 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. This is the goal for all of the HETC's documented evidence (e.g., emigrant trail literature of all types: analysis, papers, field minutes, educational brochures, etc.).

HETC Policy: All inventory documents will be developed from a NPOV which means 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.

b) Verifiability For the HETC, verifiability means other researchers and the public reading its educational brochures or other emigrant trail literature can check where the information comes from and make their own determination if the references or sources are reliable. The HETC'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 an HETC document. It does not ask for their trust. Its goal is to empower other researchers and the public through educational materials that can be checked in order for them to find their own truth.

HETC Policy: Verifiability means that interpretations and opinions, including analyses, documentation, and conclusions, in its inventory documents must have their source references in order for other researchers or neighbors to go to the original documents and make their own decisions about the reliability and/or credibility of the material. From the HETC's point of view it values alternative inventory views as legitimate hypothesis for disclosure, public discussion, documentation (DDD).

c) Sources When writing an inventory document, credit must be given to the sources used in its preparation. The most basic bibliography entry consists of the author name(s), article title, encyclopedia or dictionary name, year published, and medium. An inventory document includes all analysis and documentation by the HETC, including potentially standalone appendices, attachments, maps, tables, etc.

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

Where available, academic and peer-reviewed publications are usually the most reliable sources, such as in history, medicine, and science.

greater the degree of scrutiny given to these issues, the more reliable the source. A big exception is some of the HETC's best evidence: diaries, journals, and reminiscences. In this instance the HETC will use the MET rule - *Though it may not apply in*

all situations, as a general rule the closer in time the evidence is in relation to the trail under investigation [primary source], the more reliable that evidence becomes (Section IV.B).

HETC Policy: All inventory documents will be developed to cover verifiability which means that people reading and editing the encyclopedia can check that the information comes from reliable sources. All HETC documents will have the normal bibliographic information

What Counts as a Reliable Source? For purposes of the HETC's work, the word "source" has 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).

Articles are to be based on reliable, third-party, 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". Oral statements and unpublished materials are not considered reliable. Use sources that directly support the material presented in an article and are appropriate to the claims made. 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. Where available, academic and peer-reviewed publications are usually the most reliable sources, such as in history, medicine, and science.

Emigrant trail researchers may also use material from reliable non-academic sources, particularly if it appears in respected mainstream publications. Other reliable sources include the following.

- University-level Textbooks
- Books Published by Respected Publishing Houses
- Work by Hetc, or its Members
- Work by Other Emigrant Trail Organizations
- Work by Other Emigrant Trail Researchers
- Magazines
- Journals
- Mainstream Newspapers

HETC Policy: Reliable sources are members of the HETC and third-party, published sources with a reputation for fact-checking and accuracy.

HETC Policy: All *Trail* inventory documents (i.e., analysis and MET documentation compliance) developed will be certified for verifiability, or identified as an alternate hypothesis, or material not mutually supporting.

B. HETC Open Principles Of Inventory Information

The HETC adopts the eight principles of open government data. The Internet is the public space of the modern world, and through it the HETC now has the opportunity to better understand the needs of neighbors so they may participate more fully in the Applegate Trail inventory process (i.e., research, mapping, and marking). Trail information becomes more valuable as it is shared, less valuable as it is hoarded. Open inventories promotes increased civil discourse, improves public welfare, and a more efficient use of resources.

Eight (8) Principles of Open Government Data

<http://www.opengovdata.org/home/8principles>

The following is a set of fundamental principles for open government data. By embracing the eight principles, the HETC, HNAHS, can become more effective, transparent, and relevant to its citizens' lives.

The HETC data shall be considered open if the data are made public in a way that complies with the following eight principles.

1. Data Must Be Complete All HETC data is public data and are made available. Data are electronically stored information or recordings, including but not limited to documents, databases, transcripts, and audio/visual recordings. Public data are data that are not subject to valid privacy, security or privilege limitations, as governed by other statutes.

2. Data Must Be Primary Data are published as collected at the source, with the finest possible level of granularity, not in aggregate or modified forms (i.e., exceptions at Section IV.B).

3. Data Must Be Timely Data are made available as quickly as necessary to preserve the value of the data.

4. Data Must Be Accessible Data are available to the widest range of users for the widest range of purposes.

5. Data Must Be Machine Processable Data are reasonably structured to allow automated processing of it.

6. Access Must Be Non-Discriminatory Data are available to anyone, with no requirement of registration.

7. Data Formats Must Be Non-Proprietary Data are available in a format over which no entity has exclusive control.

8. Data Must Be License-Free Data are not subject to any copyright, patent, trademark or trade secret regulation. Reasonable privacy, security and privilege restrictions may be allowed as governed by other statutes.

VI. VALUE OF DOCUMENTATION

A. Documentation – Maximize HETC Team Effectiveness and Extend the Investment

Documentation ... documentation ... documentation. No matter how it's written, it's difficult to get excited about documentation. The word conjures images of large binders filled with pages and pages of information that will likely never see the light of day. If done well, however, documentation can yield improved performance and profits across the historical organization for the long term.

Too often adequate documentation is missing from trail mapping deliverables. With the natural volunteer human response to minimize work and increase the fun of marking trails – leaders regularly reduce or eliminate the effort spent on documentation to reduce time and effort for the overall project for more time in the field. The normal compliant, “*We don't seem to get to the ground spending too much time on process.*”

When documentation has been created for a non-controversial inventory, it frequently misses the mark and is not useful for the long term with future researchers. Writing down every detail about an inventory does not mean it has been well documented. It just means that the raw data required to start the creation of good documentation has been collected.

When supporting documentation, for the MET compliance requirement *to examine and document all the relevant written, cartographic, physical, and artifact evidence*, has not been developed for a controversial *Trail* inventory, the HETC does a disservice to its credibility, and the long-term value of *Trail* inventories for other researchers and the public. No one will know the details better than the informed HETC member at the time of the analysis and inventory decision. The big idea is that documentation encourages knowledge and ownership.

B. The Value of Documentation

Well done documentation eases the challenges of change and adds to long-term project success. It presents information in a manner easy for the reader to absorb, understand and act upon. Its goal is to improve performance by educating users and decision makers on resource values.

Collection of Best Practices. Documentation should represent the collective wisdom of top performers in the HETC and OCTA coupled with the insights of external experts and other resources. If the intended user of the documentation is open to learning, then improved performance, higher job satisfaction and improvement are sure to follow.

Consistent Execution. The chances of new inventories being used correctly across the landscape are enhanced when using good documentation. Consistent execution of best practices is often the quickest and most effective way to improve bottom line results. Accurate, organized and interesting documentation can improve process consistency if it is part of an effective overall communication plan.

Potential Funding. Everything else being equal the accessibility of adequate emigrant trail inventory work, especially when it is web published, acts as an outreach and education program which in turn could make the difference in potential funding by agencies and government not familiar with the works of relatively unknown researchers and/or small volunteer organizations.

C. How Can Documentation be Improved?

Plan For It. Allow for the creation of top-rate documentation when project planning. Often when faced with many project tasks such as email training, quality assurance MET Manual testing and stakeholder communication – documentation efforts fall to the bottom of the priority list.

Without creating distinct documentation tasks in the inventory process, relevant documentation may find itself missing from volunteer priorities because of family conflicts and other deadlines. Analysis and documentation standards can also fail because of external pressures and deadlines (e.g., field trip, meeting, and publishing deadlines; others' schedules hinged to potential funding; etc.).

In reality much of what is already done for training, project design, and communication through the use of field trip minutes and educational brochures may be considered part of documentation. Component pieces (content) may contribute to several end products. When seen in the overall context of prepared written material, these interdependent tasks should leverage what has been decided and recorded across the tasks. It's all in how the material gets used.

Be Organized. Documentation should be well organized, written in terms familiar to the users, and easy to understand. Just as collection and availability of key data do not in themselves make it useful information, documentation must be thoughtfully presented and organized to provide value to the user. Organizing content along MET policies and inventory hypothesis scenarios enables users to easily find answers to common questions.

Web documentation affords additional opportunities to organize the information in ways that enhance the usability. Inventory education brochures are perfect for the reader's needs and can be relatively quickly presented by online documentation. Issue ideas from HETC members and OCTA experts can also be included with online documentation, further guiding users on how to improve performance.

Be Creative and Entertaining. Use several types of media when creating the best documentation. While the written word is most often used, the use of graphics or video clips yields an improved visual variety and may assist the audience to quickly understand difficult concepts where visual cues can be effective.

Frequent examples are recommended for the best documentation. Different people learn in different ways. Some people can absorb and understand a concept more clearly when visualizing the actions of others.

Be Accessible. Inject documentation into the inventory process whenever possible. Get key messages in front of members of the HNAHS, users, and the public early in the trail project design and inventory process. Leverage documentation during email training sessions. Intersperse exercises throughout the document to encourage users to follow along and make notes during classroom training. When users make personal notes in a document they feel a greater sense of ownership and incorporate it into their daily work routine.

Test It. Pilot documentation, just like you would pilot classroom HETC or OCTA training prior to rollout. Learn how the users leverage documentation in their daily routine and how the initial draft can be enhanced to better meet their needs.

Reference It. When users question how to use the inventory process, instead of answering their question verbally, point them to the specific area in the documentation that explains the best practice. Ideally – the troubleshooting section already references their question and suggests a course of action to fix the issue. This way, the user community learns how to solve these issues on their own – speeding resolution time and improving morale.

D. Why Invest in Top Rate Documentation?

Placing the appropriate focus on documentation enables users to fully employ new information or processes consistently over time (i.e., OCTA will soon be updating the MET Manual). The further away from the implementation of a new system or process, the more important that documentation can be to newcomers to the function. It can be one of the critical components of projects that help to ensure ongoing success.

VIII. COMPLIANCE WITH ADEQUACY INFORMATION ANALYSIS ELEMENTS, OR NOT

Compliance with Standards, Rules, or Laws For the HETC compliance is a condition where a written explanation(s) is made available how substantial evidence/facts lead to the conclusion that HETC's adequate information analysis elements 1 - 5 are met, or are not satisfied. This means that if one or more of HETC's adequate information analysis elements 1 - 5 are not met, that the emigrant trail inventory is not adequate (i.e., all analysis and decision inventory elements must be met, or the "conclusion" about compliance is not met).

A. Met

Element 1.	Information is Understood.
Element 2.	Supporting Arguments Are Made
Element 3.	Standard(s) of Review Are Identified
Element 4.	Applicable Evidence/Facts Are Provided
Element 5.	References and Sources of Information Are Provided

B. Not Met

Element 1.	Information is Not Understood.
Element 2.	Supporting Arguments Are Not Made
Element 3.	Standard(s) of Review Are Not Identified
Element 4.	Applicable Evidence/Facts Are Not Provided
Element 5.	References and Sources of Information Are Not Provided

A big idea is that compliance must be reviewable at the highest level, including an administrative MMM Committee having jurisdiction to review whether these principles have been applied appropriately. For our short term purposes the HETC and the public are the compliance reviewers for final HETC inventories. In only a few instances would the HNAHS Board become involved as compliance reviewers (e.g., fiscal concerns, policy compliance issues, etc.).

An action is also not met or not in compliance if the researcher exceeds their authority or the evidence is insufficient. For purposes of OCTA signage markers placed by HETC, the inventories are authenticated by an authenticator(s) representing NWOCTA.

1. Inventory Action Exceeds its Authority

- Inventory action exceeded its jurisdiction;
- Inventory action is not in compliance with policy; or
- Inventory action violates a provision of applicable law and is prohibited as a matter of law.

2. Inventory Evidence is Insufficient

- There was virtually no evidence to support the inventory.
- The supporting evidence was so undermined by other evidence that it was unreasonable for the researcher to decide as he did.
- Inventory action errors that prejudice the substantial rights of other researchers and the public.
- Inventory action improperly construes the applicable law.

Finally, compliance must be reviewable. A contact person, author, or organization must be designated to respond to people trying to use the data. A contact person must be designated to respond to complaints about violations of the principles. An administrative or judicial court must have the jurisdiction to review whether the HNAHS, other organization, or agency has applied these principles appropriately.

3. Compliance In general, compliance means conforming to a rule, such as a specification, policy, standard or law. Regulatory compliance describes the goal that public organizations, corporations, or public agencies aspire to achieve in their efforts to ensure that personnel are aware of and take steps (e.g., HNAHS policies, guidelines, etc.) to comply with relevant laws and regulations, and policies.

Due to the increasing number of regulations and need for operational transparency, organizations are increasingly adopting the use of consolidated and harmonized sets of compliance controls. This approach is used to ensure that all necessary governance requirements can be met without the unnecessary duplication of effort and activity from resources.

Compliance in the USA generally means compliance with laws and regulations. These laws can have criminal or civil penalties or can be regulations. Compliance for the HNAHS means its policies. The definition of what constitutes an effective compliance plan has been elusive.

4. Compliance Standards Not Met

For the HETC compliance is a condition where a written explanation(s) is made available how substantial evidence/facts lead to the conclusion that HETC's adequate information analysis elements 1 - 5 are met, or are not satisfied. This means that if one or more of HETC's adequate information analysis elements 1 - 5 are not met, that the compliance standards are not met, and the emigrant trail inventory is not adequate.

IX. PROPOSED GUIDELINES

A. Guidelines

These proposed guidelines were developed solely by the author, Mike Walker, Member of HETC, and the Education Chair Board Member, HNAHS, for consideration by the HETC.

B. Policy

The author may revisit these draft guidelines for final action if compliance becomes an issue. The purpose of finalization of the guidelines would be for him to make a motion to the HNAHS, as a member of the HETC and Board member of the HNAHS, that the guidelines become policy of the HHAHS equal to its three other policy directions for emigrant trail inventories.

- Trail Mapping Committee, Office of National Trails Preservation & Oregon-California Trails Association. July 2002, 4th edition. *Mapping Emigrant Trails MET Manual*. Independence, MO.
- *Hugo Neighborhood*. May 14, 2005. *Mapping Action Plan For Applegate Trail Program*. Hugo, OR.
- Northwest Chapter, Oregon-California Trails Association (NWOCTA); *Hugo Neighborhood*; and the Josephine County Historical Society (JCHS). March 2012. *Hugo Applegate Trail Marking & Mapping Project Agreement*. Hugo, OR.

The background to this potential issue is that the HETC had been fortunate for perhaps a decade in not having major conflicting interpretations and/or opinions among its members while verifying emigrant trail sites. That could change as the HETC starts researching, mapping, and marking sites in the “Big Ugly.” This term is a playful caption of the potential *Trail* sites that do not have surveys (i.e., GLO, DLC, and modern surveys), and where interpretive opinions have more impacts due to the void of survey facts. In a geographic sense it usually means the land between the GLO section line surveys (i.e., the “Big Ugly” is an average mile between surveyed sites).

X. CONCLUSION

The HETC, *Hugo Neighborhood*, believes that historical trail inventories must be systematically and comprehensively documented for verification and reliability of evidence. Toward that goal the HETC combines ideas from HNAHS's and OCTA missions, the MET Manual, and its own ideas about adequate information supporting verification and reliability. It is the policy of the HNAHS that the MET compliance standards are followed.

The MET Manual analysis is a systematic process based on evidence, and on sound, repeatable thought processes that must be complied with. One of the MET's compliance standards is to examine and document all the relevant written, cartographic, physical, and artifact evidence.

The bottom line, the HETC's responsibility is to conduct analysis and documentation to support an trail inventory decision prior to any marking. The method of analysis and documentation is identified in the *OCTA MET Manual*. The easy things are readily resolved; the difficult problems may require additional research and field work. All too often the exact location of an emigrant trail segment cannot be verified with absolute certainty. In most situations, however, the trail researcher can strive for a higher degree of probability by utilizing all the available evidence and following correct procedures.

The author may revisit these proposed guidelines for final action if compliance with MET becomes an issue. The purpose of finalization would be for him to make a motion to the HNAHS as a member of the HETC and HNAHS Board member that the guidelines become policy of the HHAHS just like its three other policy directions for emigrant trail inventories (Chpts. III & IX).

The background to this potential issue is that the HETC had been fortunate for perhaps a decade in not having major conflicting interpretations and/or opinions among its members while verifying emigrant trail sites. There is the potential this could change as the HETC starts researching, mapping, and marking sites in the "Big Ugly." This term is a playful caption of the potential *Trail* sites that do not have surveys (i.e., GLO, DLC, and modern surveys), and where interpretive opinions have more impacts due to the void of survey facts. In a geographic sense it usually means the land between the GLO section line surveys (i.e., the "Big Ugly" is an estimated one mile between GLO surveyed sites).

APPENDICES

Appendix A. Evidence Not Mutually Supporting
Appendix B. Neutral Point of View & Verifiability

Appendix A. Evidence Not Mutually Supporting

The conclusion of the MET Manual states the quandary of “evidence not mutually supporting” well (MET Manual page 12).

Trail Mapping Committee, Office of National Trails Preservation & Oregon-California Trails Association.
July 2002, 4th edition. *Mapping Emigrant Trails MET Manual*. Independence, MO.

These **guidelines for determining trail remnants and segments can not cover all situations** (emphasis added). Even our most experienced trail trackers **encountered puzzling anomalies leading to unanswerable questions** (emphasis added). Why has the trail vanished in some undisturbed places while in other undisturbed places – often very near, in similar terrain, and with identical soil conditions – the trail remains in pristine condition? **Quite often there is no obvious explanation** (emphasis added) why no visible trace remains when it can be established beyond doubt that the trail passed that way. Why do some remaining ruts, swales and depressions appear so differently? Why are some swales twenty feet wide and several feet deep while on a segment perhaps a half mile back, in similar terrain, the trail is no wider than one wagon and consists of a shallow depression? **There is much to learn** (emphasis added) about the conditions that have led to the survival of some trail traces and the disappearance of others.

Most trail segments that remain visible today have been impacted by man and nature during the post-emigrant period (emphasis added). Subsequent human impact on earlier emigrant trails may have taken the form of stage, freighting, or ranch use and even road building. Nature may have been involved, in which case the trail may not appear as an eroded trough, deep, wide swale or gully. In some sand areas, wind will have blown away loose soil and sand, leaving huge, deep, wide swales not covered with grass. Where the original emigrant trail has not had some kind of subsequent use or impact, it may have all but vanished – gradually fading into the surrounding terrain. Often, only vestiges of emigrant trails remain, barely kept visible by cattle and humans walking on them. Therefore, the vanishing character of emigrant trails makes it all the more imperative that we locate, verify, and map them before they become indistinguishable from the surrounding landscape.

The Mapping Committee is convinced that careful adherence to the MET research and investigative procedures will lead to increased accuracy in locating and verifying emigrant trails (emphasis added). Also, **gathering as much information as possible before going into the field** (emphasis added) – from diaries, GLO plats, old survey, and maps, and more recent public and private surveys – will make the mapping task much more effective. However, all experienced trail mappers have learned that the **more research and field verification they conduct the more questions they raise** (emphasis added) that, in turn, lead to longer hours in the field seeking verification of trails. **One should avoid jumping to quick conclusions** (emphasis added). When in doubt, contact other MET mappers and engage them in a dialogue.

They may have alternative solutions and/or insights. Involving other trail experts is always helpful in **resolving conflicting evidence or seemingly unanswerable questions** (emphasis added). No single person is capable of furnishing all the answers. **The more questions and alternatives that are raised and reviewed, the closer the record comes to being an accurate representation of the past** (emphasis added).

Most importantly, the mapper should conduct field investigation and authentication with an **open mind** (emphasis added). The easy things are readily resolved; the difficult problems may require additional research and field work. The mapper should avoid going into the field with **preconceptions that lead to “make things fit” especially when they don’t seem to square with the evidence** (emphasis added). **The MET program is open-ended. It is designed to allow for doubts and to provide for corrections and additions as new materials and evidence come to light** (emphasis added). History is a matter of building upon what has gone before. **It isn’t a matter of being “right.”** (emphasis added) It is more a matter of putting forth what research has indicated has the highest degree of probability. All mapping endeavors should be considered as the opening of an on-going dialogue. That’s the historical process at work.

Appendix B. Neutral Point of View & Verifiability

Outline

1. Principles
2. Neutral Point of View & Verifiability
3. Neutral Point of View
4. Verifiability
5. Substantial Evidence
6. Verifiability, Not Truth
7. Regulatory Compliance
8. Primary, Secondary, and Tertiary Sources
9. No Original Research

1. Principles

Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia's

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Principles>

The English Wikipedia does not have a single, definitive statement of the community's values and principles. Over the years, several editors have written summaries of these values and principles as well as essays expressing their ideas about what is important. Here's a list of some of these popular pages:

- [Wikipedia - Five pillars](#): Perhaps the most popular, this was written as a simple summary for new editors.
- [User - Jimbo Wales/Statement of principles](#): One of the oldest, this statement of principles was written by a founder.
- [Wikipedia - Trifecta](#): This three-point simplified ruleset was the precursor to the Five Pillars page.
- [Wikipedia - Core content policies](#): Brief summary and a bit of background on our core content policies.
- [Wikipedia - Wikipedia is an encyclopedia](#): Blunt and to the point laying out of what Wikipedia is
- [Wikipedia - Wikipedia in brief](#): Focuses on the encyclopedic nature of the project.
- [Wikipedia - Simplified ruleset](#): A longer page with more detail.
- [Wikipedia - Ethics](#): A list of various ethical codes
- [Wikipedia - Ethical Code for Wikipedians](#)
- [Wikipedia - Purpose](#): Wikipedia's purpose
- [User - Andrewa/creed](#): What Wikipedians believe
- [Wikipedia - Pledges](#): Specific principles individual Wikipedians pledge to uphold
- [Wikipedia - Product, process, policy](#): The three Ps
- [Wikipedia - Here to build an encyclopedia](#): Behaviors that build, or destroy, the project.
- [Wikipedia - 8 simple rules for editing our encyclopedia](#)
- [Wikipedia - Ten Simple Rules for Editing Wikipedia](#)
- [Wikipedia - Historical archive/Rules to consider](#)

All of these pages are intended to be informative and helpful to editors. None of these pages themselves are official policies or guidelines of the English Wikipedia community.

See Also

- [Wikipedia - Expectations and norms of the Wikipedia community, supplement](#)
- [Wikipedia - Editorial oversight and control, summary of various processes and structures](#)
- [Wikipedia - Introduction / Wikipedia:About, introductory pages](#)
- [Wikipedia - History of Wikipedian processes and people, historical](#)
- [Wikipedia - Governance, directory of links related to Wikipedia governance](#)
- [Wikipedia - IPs are human too, an essay](#)
- [Wikipedia - The rules are principles, an essay](#)
- [Wikipedia - Reasonability Rule, an essay](#)
- [Wikipedia - Wikiness, an essay](#)
- [Wikipedia - Why Wikipedia is so great, an essay](#)
- [Wikipedia - Five pillars of evil, a humorous essay](#)

Further Reading

- [Mission statement - The Wikimedia Foundation](#)
- [Wikimedia values - The six values of the Wikimedia Foundation](#)
- [In a nutshell, what is Wikipedia? And what is the Wikimedia Foundation? - The Wikimedia Foundation](#)
- [Wikimedia founding principles - Principles generally supported by all of the Wikimedia communities](#)
- [Wikimedia Ethics - Principles of ethics in-regards to online media](#)

2. Neutral Point of View & Verifiability

The topic of “Neutral Point of View & Verifiability” is narrow and is not about *Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia’s* two dozen or more principles highlighted in Section, Appendix B.1. The focus is two of its three core content policies for web publishing articles: 1. Neutral Point of View (NPOV) and 2. Verifiability.

Wikipedia’s Three Core Content Policies

1. Neutral Point of View (NPOV)
2. Verifiability
3. No Original Research" (NOR)

HETC’s Two Core Content Policies

1. Neutral Point of View (NPOV)
2. Verifiability

3. Neutral Point of View

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Neutral_point_of_view

Editing from a neutral point of view (NPOV) means **representing fairly, proportionately, and, as far as possible, without bias, all of the significant views** (emphasis added) that have been published by reliable sources on a topic. All *Wikipedia* articles and other encyclopedic content must be written from a neutral point of view. NPOV is a fundamental principle of Wikipedia and of other Wikimedia projects. This policy is nonnegotiable and all editors and articles must follow it.

"Neutral point of view" is one of *Wikipedia’s* three core content policies. The other two are "Verifiability" and "No original research". These three core policies jointly determine the type and quality of material that is acceptable in *Wikipedia* articles. Because these policies work in harmony, they should not be interpreted in isolation from one another, and editors should try to familiarize themselves with all three. The principles upon which this policy is based cannot be superseded by other policies or guidelines, or by editor consensus.

4. Verifiability

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:V>

In *Wikipedia*, verifiability means that people reading and editing the encyclopedia can check that the information comes from reliable sources. *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** (emphasis added).

5. Substantial Evidence

Legal Burden Of Proof

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Legal_burden_of_proof

Substantial evidence. In some appeals from decisions of administrative agencies, the courts apply a "substantial evidence" standard of review over the agency's factual findings. In the United States, for example, if a Social Security Disability Insurance claimant is found "not disabled" (and, therefore, ineligible for benefits) by an Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) and the claimant appeals, both the Appeals Council (the body within the Social Security Administration that hears appeals from decisions of ALJs) and the Federal courts (which, in this type of case, will normally hear an appeal only after the claimant has exhausted all administrative remedies) will look to see whether the administrative law judge's **decision was supported by "substantial evidence" or not. Substantial evidence is "more than a mere scintilla. It means such relevant evidence as a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion."** (emphasis added)

Facts: usually refer to the usage as a plural noun of fact, an incontrovertible truth.

6. Verifiability, Not Truth

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

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

Wikipedia's core sourcing policy, *Wikipedia: Verifiability*, used to define the threshold for inclusion in *Wikipedia* as "verifiability, not truth". " Verifiability" was used in this context to mean that material added to *Wikipedia* must have been published previously by a reliable source. Editors may not add their own views to articles simply because they believe them to be correct, and may not remove sources' views from articles simply because they disagree with them.

The phrase "the threshold for inclusion is verifiability, not truth" meant that verifiability is a necessary condition (a minimum requirement) for the inclusion of material, though it is not a sufficient condition (it may not be enough). Sources must also be appropriate, and must be used carefully, and must be balanced relative to other sources per *Wikipedia's* policy on due and undue weight.

Wikipedia's articles are intended as intelligent summaries and reflections of current published debate within the relevant fields, an overview of the relevant literature. The Verifiability policy is related to another core content policy, Neutral point of view, which holds that we include all significant views on a subject. Citing reliable sources for any material challenged or likely to be challenged gives readers the chance to check for themselves that the most appropriate sources have been used, and used well.

That we have rules for the inclusion of material does not mean *Wikipedians* have no respect for truth and accuracy, just as a court's reliance on rules of evidence does not mean the court does not respect truth. *Wikipedia* values accuracy, but it *requires* verifiability. Unlike some encyclopedias, *Wikipedia* does not try to impose "the truth" on its readers, and does not ask that they trust something just because they read it in *Wikipedia*. We empower our readers. We don't ask for their blind trust.

Threshold: This word has multiple meanings, and the relevant one is "The point at which an action is triggered, especially a lower limit." (emphasis added) This means that the *absolute minimum standard* for including information in *Wikipedia* is verifiability. If the information is not verifiable, you must not include it under any circumstances. Merely meeting the absolute minimum standard for inclusion is not sufficient. Material may be verifiable, but still banned by several other content policies, including *Wikipedia: Neutral point of view*, *Wikipedia: Copyright violations*, *Wikipedia: What Wikipedia* is not, and editorial judgment about whether this article is an appropriate place for presenting that information.

Verifiability: In *Wikipedia's* sense, material is verifiable if it can be directly supported by at least one **reliable published source**. Verifiability is *not* determined by whether the material has already been supplied with an inline citation.

Not truth: It is not good enough for information to be true, and it is definitely not good enough for you to (perhaps wrongly) believe it to be true. *Wikipedia* values accuracy, but it *requires* verifiability. You are allowed and encouraged to add material that is verifiable *and* true; you are absolutely prohibited from adding any material that is *un-verifiable*, with zero exceptions—even if the un-verifiable material is true.

Why Not True? Truth isn't always something as clear and unquestionable as we may desire. In many cases, such as in **topics related to social sciences, there is no "truth" but simply opinions and assumptions** (emphasis added). Which is the best political system? Was this or that government a good or bad one? There are no "true" answers to such questions. **There are facts, opinions, facts about opinions and opinions about opinions** (emphasis added).

Besides, truth is only a boolean value (only 100% true or 100% false) in certain technical contexts, such as maths or programming language. **In most other topics, there is 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, even misunderstandings.** (emphasis added) 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. For example, the existence or not of extraterrestrial civilizations, or the nature of a certain unidentified flying object. There is indeed a factual answer (either there are extraterrestrial civilizations, or there are not), but we are not 100% certain of it.

7. Regulatory Compliance

Wikipedia: Compliance

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Regulatory_compliance

In general, compliance means conforming to a rule, such as a specification, policy, standard or law. Regulatory compliance describes the goal that corporations or public agencies aspire to achieve in their efforts to ensure that personnel are aware of and take steps to comply with relevant laws and regulations.

Due to the increasing number of regulations and need for operational transparency, organizations are increasingly adopting the use of consolidated and harmonized sets of compliance controls. This approach is used to ensure that all necessary governance requirements can be met without the unnecessary duplication of effort and activity from resources.

Compliance in the USA generally means compliance with laws and regulations. These laws can have criminal or civil penalties or can be regulations. **The definition of what constitutes an effective compliance plan has been elusive.** (emphasis added)

8. Primary, Secondary, and Tertiary Sources

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Primary_Secondary_and_Tertiary_Sources

Identifying and using primary and secondary sources requires careful thought and some extra knowledge on the part of authors. In determining the type of source, there are three separate, basic characteristics to identify.

1. Is this source self-published or not?
2. Is this source independent or third-party, or is it closely affiliated with the subject?
3. Is this source primary or not?

The concept of primary, secondary, and tertiary sources originated with the academic discipline of historiography.

The point was to give historians a handy way to indicate how close the source of a piece of information was to the actual events. Importantly, the concept developed to deal with "events", rather than ideas or abstract concepts. A primary source was a source that was created at about the same time as the event, regardless of the source's contents. (emphasis added) So while a dictionary is an example of a tertiary source, an ancient dictionary is actually a primary source—for the meanings of words in the ancient world.

There are no quaternary sources: Either the source is primary, or it describes, comments on, or analyzes primary sources (in which case, it is secondary), or it relies heavily or entirely on secondary sources (in which case, it is tertiary). The first published source for any given fact is always considered a primary source. The historians' concept has been extended into other fields, with partial success.

9. No Original Research

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:No_original_research

Wikipedia articles must not contain original research. **The phrase "original research" (OR) is used on Wikipedia to refer to material—such as facts, allegations, and ideas—for which no reliable, published sources exist.** (emphasis added) This includes any analysis or synthesis of published material that serves to advance a position not advanced by the sources. To demonstrate that you are not adding, you must be able to cite reliable, published sources that are directly related to the topic of the article, and directly support the material being presented.

The prohibition against OR means that all material added to articles must be *attributable* to a reliable published source, even if not actually *attributed*. The verifiability policy says that an inline citation to a reliable source must be provided for all quotations, and for anything challenged or likely to be challenged—but a source *must* exist even for material that is never challenged. For example: the statement "Paris is the capital of France" needs no source, because no one is likely to object to it and we know that sources exist for it. The statement is *attributable*, even if not *attributed*.

Despite the need to attribute content to reliable sources, you must not plagiarize them or violate their copyrights. Articles should be written in your own words while substantially retaining the meaning of the source material.

"No original research" (NOR) is one of three core content policies that, along with Neutral point of view and Verifiability, determines the type and quality of material acceptable in articles. Because these policies work in harmony, they should not be interpreted in isolation from one another, and editors should familiarize themselves with all three.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Hugo Neighborhood Association & Historical Society. May 2005. *Mapping Action Plan For Applegate Trail Program*. For Hugo Emigrant Trails Committee. Hugo, OR.

Hugo Native American Team, Hugo Neighborhood Association & Historical Society. August 12, 2012. *Appendix F. Maps For Use In Identifying & Mapping Indian Trails, Indian Trail Over Grave Creek Hills: 1855*. Hugo, OR.

Northwest Chapter, Oregon-California Trails Association; *Hugo Neighborhood*; and Josephine County Historical Society. March 2012. *Hugo Applegate Trail Marking & Mapping Project Agreement*. Hugo, OR.

Trail Mapping Committee, Office of National Trails Preservation & Oregon-California Trails Association. July 2002, 4th edition. *Mapping Emigrant Trails MET Manual*. Independence, MO.

Walker, Mike, Co-Project Leader, HETC; Education Chair, HNAHS. Draft July 4, 2012. *Historical Trail Inventories Must Document Verification And Reliability of Evidence*. Hugo, OR.

Walker, Mike, Co-Project Leader, HETC; Education Chair, HNAHS. Draft July 4, 2012. *Scientific & MET Manual Methods*. Hugo, OR.

Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia. *Welcome to Wikipedia, the Free Encyclopedia That Anyone Can Edit*. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Main_Page.

Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia. *Wikipedia: Five Pillars*. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Five_pillars.

Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia. *Wikipedia: Neutral point of view*. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Neutral_point_of_view.

Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia. *Wikipedia: Verifiability*. <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Verifiability>.