

America OS Working Document

Governance framework and policy decisions

Updated October 14, 2026

1 Purpose and current direction

America OS is a proposed redesign of American government intended to improve people's wellbeing, move governing power closer to the communities affected by it, protect individual rights, and make public authority financially and ethically accountable. The United States would remain a constitutional republic, with protected local self-government for urban and rural communities, states managing defined shared systems, and the federal government carrying out defined national responsibilities.

Individual direction of tax contributions remains a core commitment. Each person should decide how their own contribution is used, including the ability to refuse funding for military assistance. The proposal frames this as a matter of conscience and consent. Other people's preferences cannot substitute for an individual's authorization.

Ecosystem enhancement is also a core platform commitment. Agriculture, land management, and public policy should improve the living systems that sustain people. This includes regenerative agriculture, clean waterways, native habitat restoration, farmer independence, accountable agricultural markets, and the freedom to restore ecosystems on private residential land.

The September 18 discussion adds the elimination of recurring property taxes, a preference for consumption-based funding over taxes on income and ownership, and a requirement that government demonstrate competence before exercising taxing authority. Financial failure should remove the incumbent administration's control of funds. Residential ownership limits and compulsory divestment are intended to make homeownership dramatically more affordable. Exact limits, financing, and transition rules remain open.

The subsequent federal income-tax decision establishes a \$500,000 annual allowance per person for eligible work and business income before age 30, with relief tapering from age 30 through 35. Before 30, only income above the allowance enters the ordinary progressive brackets, starting at the bottom. The project also selects elimination of taxes on dividends and capital gains at every age. State implementation, payroll taxes, revenue replacement, and detailed administration remain unresolved. Section 6 records the selected calculation and scope.

The latest selected framework gives existing cities, villages, and suitable town or township governments the same baseline right to local self-government. New rural municipalities or districts would cover areas without suitable existing local representation. Every resident must belong to a jurisdiction responsible for the defined local powers. Districts are no longer a mandatory layer above cities or a special status required to obtain autonomy. Regional service cooperation and voluntary governmental mergers remain available.

Residents must have binding authority to approve or reject consequential development in their community. Communities may preserve their character, limit growth, and choose their own housing responses; America OS does not require every community to provide affordable housing or subsidize another community. Exact voting procedures and the relationship between collective land-use decisions and individual rights remain open.

Cincinnati, Ohio, remains the selected present-day spending case study. Its cross-state metropolitan connections illustrate the need for cooperation across Ohio, Kentucky, and Indiana, not an adopted boundary

or a decision to merge those communities. Sections 3 and 4 replace the earlier universal district structure; the earlier reasoning and changes are preserved in Section 15.

The September 25 additions establish congressional pay tied to ordinary earnings and shorter, readable legislation. The October 11–12 discussion selects a national median-worker-earnings baseline adjusted for the represented state’s regional prices for federal legislators, with state and local earnings baselines for their respective officials. It adds political-money reform, candidate qualification and information, and digital participation directions. Detailed mechanisms and unresolved choices retain the status stated below.

The later policy discussion establishes consequence-based accountability as a selected direction. Businesses and public decision-makers should answer for preventable harms arising from their decisions even when those decisions have not resulted in a criminal conviction. The project also selects development of a public accountability tracker connecting responsible people, their decisions, documented consequences, supporting evidence, and demanded changes. Its detailed standards and publication process remain working proposals. The October 2 clarification establishes layered responsibility within a business hierarchy, differentiated consequences, and a duty to investigate and respond to visible warning signs. Section 12 records the selected principles and the unresolved enforcement standards.

The healthcare discussion selects a starting payment framework: pay for verified readiness, fund necessary care, and reward independently verified health, function, and safety at the lowest sustainable total cost consistent with care, access, safety, and preparedness. Section 7 records the selected foundation, safeguards, and remaining design choices. It is a basis for further development, not a proven optimal or fully funded plan.

This working document distinguishes three statuses:

- **Selected direction:** A principle or choice expressly supported in the project discussion.
- **Working proposal:** A design developed in the discussion whose details remain available for revision.
- **Open decision:** A question, numerical threshold, or conflict that still needs an explicit decision.

These are proposed reforms. The document does not represent existing law or a completed constitutional and fiscal implementation plan.

2 Governing principles

Power close to the people. Assign a function to the smallest level of government capable of carrying it out effectively. Higher levels need specifically defined authority to intervene.

Community autonomy. Urban, suburban, and rural communities should have substantial freedom to develop their own laws, cultures, economies, and public services. The same baseline local powers must reach rural residents. Existing local governments can exercise those powers without obtaining district status or merging with neighbors.

Resident authority over development. Residents must be able to make binding collective decisions for or against consequential development. Giving officials more local power is insufficient by itself. Community character, slower growth, and locally chosen housing responses are legitimate priorities within the common rights framework; a mandate for universal local affordability has not been adopted.

Individual rights. Every level of government remains bound by a common constitutional floor protecting individuals, including minorities within a community. Nearby jurisdictions with different policies may offer more accessible relocation choices than moving to another state. That opportunity supplements rights protections and depends on actual housing, employment, and personal circumstances.

Selected direction: Individuals have the right to vote and elect their representatives at the local, state, and federal levels. Electoral eligibility, representation, procedures, and remedies still require detailed design; a person's tax contribution does not purchase additional electoral votes.

Responsibility for consequences. Communities should bear the financial consequences of their own policies. A failed government or corporation should not erase reckless or fraudulent losses using unwilling outsiders' contributions. Greater wealth alone does not establish an obligation to subsidize another community. Voluntary assistance, agreed shared-service obligations, and responsibility for demonstrable harms are distinct questions.

Accountability beyond criminal conviction. Evaluate the actual systemic consequences of business operations and public decisions, including health, ecosystems, affordability, wages, and meaningful freedom of choice. Lawfulness alone does not establish that a practice serves human flourishing. Public scrutiny and demands for corrective change need not wait for criminal conviction; findings and remedies must remain evidence-based.

Individual consent over tax use. Collection of someone's money should not establish their ethical approval of every government expenditure. Full personal direction is the intended endpoint.

Useful public institutions. Government should help people solve practical problems through shared infrastructure, scientific knowledge, technical assistance, and transparent information.

Ecosystem enhancement. Improve the health, resilience, and long-term capacity of whole ecosystems. Healthy soil is critical infrastructure within that broader commitment, alongside water, native habitats, and biodiversity.

Farmer independence and seed sovereignty. Treat seeds as a commons and protect farmers' freedom to plant, save, store, breed, and replant. Prevent private actors from using ownership claims, contracts, or market control to take those freedoms away.

Conditional fiscal authority. Government serves the public and must justify both its demand for money and its ability to administer that money. Financial accountability requires enforceable consequences rather than indefinite reliance on promises of future improvement.

Security of ownership. Eliminate recurring taxation imposed merely because a person owns property. Replacement funding, scope definitions, and existing obligations require an explicit transition.

Broad flourishing and personal responsibility. Improve the ability of people across communities to flourish, including through routes out of poverty. Expect effort and contribution from those able to provide them; specific obligations and protections remain to be designed.

Human authority and accountability. AI and data analysis should expand people's ability to understand and participate in government. Decisions affecting rights need accountable human judgment and appeal.

Selected direction: Preserve what works and prioritize urgent, critical problems. Review existing strengths and evidence of actual harm before deciding that a government function needs to change. A subject not yet developed in America OS is a gap in this document, not evidence that the current system is failing. Identify who is affected, the severity and urgency of the problem, and what is working before comparing a targeted improvement with broader redesign. Do not invent problems to justify change; consider the disruption and harms that a proposed change could introduce.

Selected clarification October 14: Government authority must be bounded and justified. Prevent purchased control of public decisions while protecting independent expression and organizing. Equalizing all

independent influence is not an adopted objective. Existing anti-corruption and campaign-finance directions remain; no new broad independent-advocacy cap, matching-fund system, or voucher system is selected.

3 Division of governing powers

Protected local self government

Selected direction: Transfer defined powers over internal social, lifestyle, and everyday policy from states to local communities. Existing cities and villages may exercise them directly. Suitable town or township governments may receive the same baseline powers. Where no suitable local government exists, create a rural municipality or district representing the relevant communities and surrounding territory.

Local government means the city, village, empowered town or township, rural district, or voluntarily consolidated government responsible for a territory. These are alternative forms at the same basic level of local authority. A district is not a mandatory government above a city, and local autonomy does not require exceptional population size or a finding that a community is culturally extreme.

Selected direction: Every resident must belong to one jurisdiction responsible for the defined set of local powers. This coverage requirement does not eliminate institutions delivering specifically shared services. It does require identifying which body sets each policy, funds each responsibility, delivers each service, and answers to residents.

Selected direction: Local responsibilities include education and curriculum; housing, land use, and development; local transportation; policing and local criminal policy; local taxation and spending; social services; utilities; parks and recreation; election administration; and local courts. These subject assignments remain bounded by the common constitutional rights floor and explicitly shared or national responsibilities. Local tax and spending authority must preserve each individual's direction of their own contribution under Section 6.

Selected direction: Assign laws affecting people's lifestyles to the local level wherever possible. Local choice is the default, and federal officials may not override a valid local lifestyle policy merely because they disagree with it. Constitutionally protected freedoms remain individual rights that every level of government must respect, with federal protection. This protection does not make all administration of a protected activity exclusively federal. Recreational-substance and abortion policies remain subjects for local-policy design within the rights framework; no particular prohibition, permission, or detailed rule has been selected.

Open decisions: Healthcare administration and business and labor regulation are not included in the newly confirmed local assignments. Possible federal healthcare administration remains under consideration, not selected. The Section 7 healthcare foundation does not assign all funding or administration to any one level. Local delivery, regional and national backup, risk pooling, research, oversight, and financing require explicit allocation.

Open decision: Turn the selected local subject list into a precise schedule of powers. Apply the local lifestyle-policy default and the individual-rights floor rather than treating that basic distinction as undecided. Define the remaining boundaries where conduct or harm crosses community lines or local policy overlaps with a separately selected national responsibility. The existing national functions remain in the model; neither automatic federal override nor an unspecified exception to local autonomy is adopted for these unresolved conflicts. The purpose is to allocate existing policy subjects, not authorize unspecified government intrusion into private life.

A charter is a community's governing rulebook. The working charter proposal defines elected institutions, executive duties, legislative powers, fiscal rules, records, audits, ethics, amendments, removal procedures, and access to independent adjudication. Local self-government does not require every small community to maintain a separate full court system or specialized administrative staff.

Rural representation

Selected direction: New rural districts would function as rural municipalities where needed. One elected government could represent several underrepresented communities and the land between them. Existing townships or other suitable local institutions should be considered before creating additional governments.

Complete coverage is required, but placing all countryside into one enormous district is not. Boundaries should reflect workable communities and geography. A county can be a starting point where it fits; using a county government dominated by a separate city to set exclusively rural policy could reproduce the representation problem. No automatic county-wide allocation of local authority has been selected.

Working proposal: For powers assigned exclusively to a rural jurisdiction, its residents elect the accountable government. Shared county or regional responsibilities have separate, explicit representation and funding arrangements. Overlapping city, village, township, county, school, and service boundaries require reconciliation, rather than transferring competing authority over the same residents.

Rural policy authority need not mean independent production of every service. Communities may share or purchase administration, equipment, technical expertise, and facilities under explicit agreements. Capacity, costs, representation, and service continuity must be demonstrated without treating wealth or urban population density as prerequisites for the basic right to self-government.

Regional cooperation and optional consolidation

Selected direction: Separate local autonomy from regional cooperation and governmental merger. A community need not merge to obtain local powers. Shared services may cross municipal, county, and state boundaries. Communities may choose to consolidate when they want one government and an agreed set of common policies.

Cincinnati's metropolitan connections across Ohio, Kentucky, and Indiana illustrate why service areas need not follow old political boundaries. Shared transportation or utility administration does not by itself establish common education, criminal, or other lifestyle rules. Those powers require an explicit agreement and legal allocation.

Working proposal: Cooperation agreements identify the service, governing authority, resident representation, public records, costs, dispute process, review, and withdrawal terms. A joint body must not acquire unrelated policymaking powers through an administrative agreement. Each agreement must fit the individual tax-direction and no-bailout principles.

A voluntary merger would establish one government for the responsibilities surrendered by its participants. Existing local names and identities may continue. The allocation of local offices, electoral representation, retained neighborhood decisions, personnel, and assets belongs in the founding agreement. Existing officials should not be assumed to retain offices automatically; the permanent structure remains to be designed.

Open decision: Establish the lawful route for cross-state arrangements, including any required state, federal, or constitutional action. A local referendum alone does not settle current state consent requirements, state membership, conflicting constitutions, courts, or federal representation. Regional cooperation and a broad cross-state governmental merger are different legal undertakings.

Open decision: Establish the practical benefit and exact relationship of cities, counties, rural districts, and cross-border arrangements before selecting a particular structure. Existing optional cooperation does not settle an additional district layer, automatic county authority, or a cross-state government. Compare service improvements, costs, resident representation, and administrative complexity with keeping or improving existing arrangements.

State responsibilities

Selected direction: States retain defined shared responsibilities while surrendering general control over policy subjects reserved to local communities. Differences in local political preferences or wealth do not themselves justify reclaiming local authority.

The working state list includes shared water and watersheds; energy grids; transportation and freight across local boundaries; commerce between communities; shared natural resources; regional disaster coordination; agreements and disputes between communities; state-level courts within their jurisdiction; and administration of legitimately shared assets and obligations.

States also provide scientific knowledge, research, technical capacity, and optional shared services. Section 7 describes this positive mission. Every retained function needs a precise scope so that a broad claim of regional concern does not restore unlimited state control.

The earlier proposed state legislature paired a population-based chamber with a Council of Districts. **Open decision:** Reconsider the second chamber's membership and voting basis under the new local-government framework. Equal versus population-weighted representation was never settled; replacing mandatory districts with many cities and rural governments must not silently determine the answer. Neither chamber would gain a general power to reclaim protected local jurisdiction.

Working proposal: Consider a state policing role focused on the state's defined shared responsibilities, such as watersheds, grids, cross-community transportation, shared resources, and disaster coordination. This is a tentative institutional design, not an adopted restriction, abolition, or replacement of existing state police. Its enforcement powers, relationship to local policing, and interstate-crime responsibilities remain open.

Federal government

Selected direction: Limit federal power to defined national functions and protection of constitutional rights, including federal law enforcement and intelligence capabilities.

Selected direction: Federal responsibilities include national defense; citizenship, immigration, and borders; interstate and international commerce with close state coordination; federal courts; interstate infrastructure and environmental matters linked to research and technological advancement; adjudication of state-boundary disputes through federal courts; and emergencies beyond regional capacity. Specific jurisdiction, delivery arrangements, funding, and limits still require design. The emergency function does not select FEMA or any other particular agency as the final institution.

Selected direction: Research and technological advancement should be primary federal functions as responsibilities better handled locally are devolved. This establishes a positive national research priority alongside the limited-government framework. Particular institutions, programs, budgets, and the allocation of healthcare administration and funding remain open.

Working inventory and open decisions: Foreign affairs remains in the earlier federal responsibility inventory. Currency and monetary policy are a probable federal assignment under discussion, not a newly finalized choice. Existing selected constitutional-rights protection and federal investigative capability remain in place.

The criteria for federal leadership in crimes crossing state borders are unresolved; crossing a border alone has not been adopted as a complete jurisdictional rule.

The breadth of each responsibility needs precise boundaries. Labeling an issue national, interstate, or an emergency must not become an unlimited grant of authority. Spending authority must also be reconciled with personal tax direction.

Founding design and the modern federal role

Historical context: The Constitution created a stronger national government than the Articles of Confederation while assigning it enumerated powers. In Federalist 45, Madison described federal powers as “few and defined” and expected most ordinary domestic governance to remain with the states. The founders disagreed about the breadth of national authority; Hamilton and Jefferson did not share a single blueprint. Sources S3 and S4 in Section 15 provide the constitutional and historical context.

Original national responsibilities included defense and diplomacy; taxation and borrowing; interstate, foreign, and tribal commerce; currency; naturalization and bankruptcy; post offices and post roads; patents and copyrights; and federal courts. Necessary and Proper authority supported implementation of granted powers. The original arrangement did not separately entrench municipal autonomy against state governments. America OS therefore proposes an additional constitutional commitment by protecting local self-government directly.

Federal authority expanded through constitutional amendments, legislation, judicial interpretation, national economic integration, wars, and emergencies. Reconstruction amendments created new federal protections against slavery and violations of civil and voting rights. The Sixteenth Amendment strengthened the constitutional basis for an unapportioned income tax. New Deal legislation and broader commerce and spending interpretations supported national economic and social programs; later grants extended federal influence into state-administered services. Some changes addressed genuine collective problems and rights violations. Neither administrative size nor historical novelty alone proves a function illegitimate. Sources S5 and S6.

Working proposal: Require every federal program and bill to identify its specific constitutional authority, national responsibility, evidence of cross-state effects or rights violations, and why lower levels cannot adequately perform the assigned function. Require proportional scope, public costs and outcomes, and periodic review. Rights enforcement does not depend on permission from the local government accused of violating rights. Reallocation requires a successor, funding, and continuity plan under Section 4; functions should not simply disappear during transition.

Resolving authority and cross boundary effects

Within a subject assigned exclusively to local government, the proposed framework prevents a conflicting state rule from overriding local policy. Within genuine state jurisdiction, shared institutions govern assigned matters. Federal constitutional rights bind every level, and valid federal authority applies within its defined sphere. This is a proposed constitutional allocation, not a claim that every current local ordinance defeats state law.

Selected clarification: Marriage, including same-sex marriage, belongs under constitutionally protected individual rights rather than discretionary local lifestyle prohibitions. Every level must respect that protection, with federal enforcement of the rights floor. State or local administration is distinct from authority to deny the protected freedom; exclusive federal licensing or federal selection of a person’s spouse

is not adopted. State opposition alone also cannot defeat policy powers properly assigned to a community. Rights enforcement and ordinary policy disagreement are different matters.

Selected direction: A person's home jurisdiction may not punish conduct carried out entirely in another jurisdiction, lawful there, merely because that person lives in the home jurisdiction. People should be free to travel between communities to engage in activities lawful at their destination. The discussion used recreational cannabis in a neighboring community as an illustration of the proposed territorial principle, not advice about current law. Scope questions involving conduct extending across a boundary, harm outside the destination, or a separately assigned national responsibility remain open. No automatic jurisdictional exception or new police-escalation rule is selected.

Open decision: Define demonstrable cross-boundary harms, causation, cost allocation, proportional remedies, and independent adjudication. Pollution or damage to shared infrastructure differs from disliking a neighboring community's policy or relative wealth. Commuting itself is not evidence of wrongful harm; a community's housing choices do not automatically establish an obligation to subsidize neighbors.

A workforce-residency percentage was raised as a possible response to cross-city costs, but no quota has been adopted. It could restrict workers' and employers' choices and raises legal concerns. Agreements for identifiable shared services and remedies for proven harms remain alternatives to evaluate. No automatic commuter charge, compulsory redistribution system, or housing-production quota has been selected.

4 Local coverage formation and transition

A complete local government map

Selected direction: Before the state relinquishes a defined policy responsibility, every resident and territory must have an identified successor local government for that responsibility. Rural residents cannot be left under broader state lifestyle control simply because they live outside a city.

Existing cities, villages, suitable towns and townships, and new rural districts together form the complete map. This replaces the earlier requirement that every area become a district. It also replaces the assumption that a district necessarily contains several cities or governs them from above.

Local self-government does not depend on a universal million-person threshold, ideological classification, or membership in a large metro. Those earlier starting concepts explain the origin of the proposal but are not current eligibility rules. Coverage must account for existing legal statuses and overlapping jurisdictions, including tribal sovereignty where relevant; the proposal does not authorize automatic redrawing of those rights.

Boundaries and unresolved coverage

Working proposal: Begin with existing communities and useful government boundaries. Use resident testimony, published criteria, independent review, and an appeal process to evaluate contiguity, geography, economic connections, practical administration, fiscal transition, and service access. Neither ideological uniformity nor wealth alone should determine access to basic self-government.

Selected direction: Communities may decline a particular merger without preventing other qualifying communities from proceeding. A refusal cannot leave residents without local representation. The remaining map must provide a viable separate jurisdiction or another resolved arrangement.

Open decisions: Determine the default arrangement when communities cannot agree on boundaries; who resolves overlapping claims; how rural districts are represented; and when a county, township, or new

institution is appropriate. Establish protections against manipulation for officeholding or extra federal representation, while allowing communities to choose their culture and development priorities. Declining a merger must be distinguished from vetoing the entire transition.

The earlier principle remains that satisfaction of objective constitutional requirements should not be defeated by an official's discretionary political objection. The legally valid certification, adjudication, and constitutional transition procedures still require design; this principle does not itself bypass existing legal consent requirements.

Voluntary merger process

Selected direction: Neighboring communities may choose to join a proposed common government or remain separate. Formation proponents should explain their reasons and intended policy direction so residents understand the choice. Yellow Springs was a hypothetical example involving cannabis policy, homeschooling, and education curriculum, not a selected boundary or a finding that these powers already exist under current law.

Working proposal: An initiating community publishes a proposal; neighboring communities negotiate participation; and the prospective members publish one founding agreement covering boundaries, powers, representation, funding, services, debts, pensions, assets, and transition. Each participating community votes on the agreement. A rejected membership does not block the others if the resulting arrangement remains viable. Define when a changed map or agreement requires another vote.

A merger creates one government for the responsibilities transferred to it. The founding policy agenda explains proponents' intentions but does not freeze future voters' policy choices. Decide electoral structure and any retained local powers before residents vote; representation in a common government does not guarantee that every participating community wins every decision.

Open decisions: Set approval and turnout thresholds separately for mandatory coverage arrangements, voluntary mergers, charter adoption, and later splits or withdrawals. Earlier discussion mentioned 75% approval, a proposed 60% turnout requirement, and an unresolved 60% combined statement. None supplies a settled numerical rule for the revised model. The earlier rejection of a subdivision veto is now distinguished from a community's ability to refuse its own voluntary merger.

Continuity of laws and services

Selected direction: Transferring authority must not leave an area without applicable laws or a functioning accountable government.

Working proposal: Preserve applicable existing laws initially. For subjects transferred exclusively to local government, those inherited rules become the starting local rules and can be amended or repealed by the authorized local institutions and resident procedures. Later state enactments would not automatically alter those reserved subjects. Valid federal rules, retained state powers, and constitutional protections continue to apply within their respective scope.

Inventory each law and responsibility before transfer. Identify who administers it, resolves disputes, enforces it, funds it, and holds the records. Elect successor governments, establish applicable charters, arrange access to courts, and settle the transfer of assets, liabilities, pensions, contracts, employees, and service obligations. Default charters and temporary service arrangements are options where custom arrangements are unfinished.

The earlier Transfer Day model proposed a statewide constitutional vote and simultaneous transfer after a two-to-three-year preparation period. **Open decision:** Determine the approval route, timetable, and whether

transfer should be simultaneous or staged now that the map uses different local forms and may involve cross-state cooperation. No authority should be relinquished before its successor arrangements are ready; the former timetable is not a final commitment.

State and county functions would be retained where genuinely shared, reassigned to successor local governments, delivered through explicit agreements, or eliminated where unnecessary. Do not preserve every existing layer automatically or add a new recurring levy simply by changing the institution's name. Existing lawful liabilities require an explicit transition, not disappearance through reorganization.

Continuing choice and evaluation

Working proposal: Establish accessible procedures for charter changes, resident initiatives, government removal, and later mergers or separation, with predictable treatment of obligations. A vote to form a government establishes initial consent; continuing resident influence requires its own rules.

Evaluate changes against pre-transition measures of representation, responsiveness, household costs, service reliability, financial integrity, and community-selected goals. Review results by community and relevant resident groups so aggregate gains do not conceal losses. These measures inform residents and test government competence; they do not impose uniform culture, housing prices, or equal outcomes on every community.

Open decisions: Choose measures, review periods, independent evaluators, remedies, and funding. Consider legal complexity across nearby boundaries, administrative capacity, capture by local interests, policy effects on neighbors, and the practical ability to relocate. Greater variation is an acknowledged tradeoff, not an automatic justification for restoring general state control.

5 Fiscal responsibility and public obligations

Local finances and the no bailout principle

Selected direction: Local governments should maintain their own budgets, treasuries, debt, pension responsibilities, and independent audits. Their obligations must not carry an implied guarantee from other local governments, the state, or the federal government.

Unwilling outsiders should not finance relief from deficits caused by reckless borrowing, corruption, unsustainable policies, failed public enterprises, or concealed liabilities. The same ethical objection was raised concerning corporate bailouts. Voluntary private assistance remains possible.

A proposed insolvency process could restructure debt and contracts, suspend discretionary spending, sell nonessential assets, change leadership, or consider a voluntary merger. Creditors and the responsible local jurisdiction bear consequences. Fraud and corruption can warrant legal penalties; ordinary policy disagreement or failure should not automatically become a crime.

The state could provide administrative receivership or technical assistance paid from the local jurisdiction's resources and voluntarily authorized support. Providing expertise would not itself erase that jurisdiction's liabilities.

Emergencies and protection of people

The earlier discussion distinguished rescuing a failed local-government balance sheet from protecting people during war, disaster, disease, or violations of constitutional rights. The project endorsed that distinction.

This does not settle how such assistance is financed under full personal tax direction. Voluntary emergency allocations, reserves, insurance, or repayable arrangements are possible design questions. No compulsory exception to individual direction has been adopted.

Shared obligations and the new consent principle

The earlier plan expressly required shared obligations to be paid before discretionary local spending. It proposed protected payments for common infrastructure, debt, and essential systems.

The September 16 direction requires complete individual control over tax use. Automatic deductions for shared obligations could conflict with that commitment. The document therefore preserves the responsibility to address shared commitments without treating a compulsory baseline as an accepted exception.

Open decision: Determine how existing debt, pensions, contracts, essential services, and shared infrastructure will be honored during transition and afterward. Any limit on personal direction must be stated explicitly and separately considered.

October 10 clarification: Prioritize balancing budgets and making the system financially workable rather than assuming the debt slate can simply be wiped clean. No general debt reset is selected. This priority does not establish a blanket ban on every lawful restructuring option already under discussion, and it does not remove the need to resolve existing obligations.

Government qualification to collect and administer revenue

Selected direction: Government must meet demonstrable standards of financial competence and accountability to qualify for imposing taxes. This applies to local, state, and federal government alike. Public institutions do not acquire an unlimited ethical claim to people's earnings merely by existing. Their authority must be justified by service to the public and subject to meaningful public control.

Taxation can be acceptable when it functions properly. The immediate institutional priority is to establish competent collection, administration, transparency, and resident control before promising spending outcomes. This clarification does not rescind the selected elimination of recurring property taxes or resolve the other tax-base questions in Section 6.

Selected direction: Financial authority is conditional on demonstrated competence. Material financial failures and serious or repeated legal violations attributable to an individual agency trigger the escalating accountability process below after independent verification and causal assessment. Repeated failure removes the incumbent administration's control of the affected money and can require replacement of the failed hierarchy. Necessary services, lawful funding purposes, and taxpayer restrictions must remain protected throughout correction, supervision, and transfer.

Working proposal: A limited, renewable fiscal authorization could specify eligible purposes, maximum rates or collections, duration, reporting duties, and service commitments. Qualification would establish eligibility to seek authorization, not an unrestricted right to raise revenue. Independent financial audits, performance reviews, transparent procurement, and enforceable correction deadlines would support the decision.

A temporary administrator would preserve authorized purposes, public records, essential operations, and existing taxpayer restrictions. Public, nonprofit, or other qualified administration could be considered; no operator type has been selected. AI could assist but would not independently exercise sovereign financial authority. The transfer should not become an outside bailout or an unrestricted takeover of local policymaking.

Open decisions: Define the serious failures and evidence thresholds that qualify for a strike, correction clocks and fiscal-year treatment, independent deciding authority, review and appeal procedures, and the conditions for resetting an agency's record after sustained recovery. Determine who appoints and pays outside supervisors, their powers and duration, restoration of financial control, and the legal changes needed for restructuring and enforceable removal. Resolve interaction with elections, lawful obligations, and individual allocation rights. No emergency override of personal tax direction has been adopted.

Agency accountability and leadership responsibility

Selected clarification: Agencies must reliably account for public money and operate within lawful funding. The process concerns material financial failures and serious or repeated legal violations attributable to the individual agency. A minor error promptly corrected is not an automatic strike; neither is the national deficit. The standard does not require each agency to generate its own revenue or independently balance the national budget. Failures must be independently verified. An audit problem does not automatically establish theft or criminal guilt.

Selected clarification: Establish causation before assigning a strike. Agencies are responsible for credible cost estimates and competent management within their authority. Budget decision-makers are responsible for the funding choices attributable to them. A failure can have shared causes. Determine what each person controlled, knew and did, including whether a funding decision left required work unsupported, before assigning institutional or personal consequences.

First strike: Issue a public corrective order identifying the failure, the leaders responsible for fixing it, their actual decision-making authority, the resources available, and binding milestones and deadlines. Establish an enforceable recovery plan and preserve the evidence needed to verify progress.

Second strike: If the required correction fails, place the affected finances under outside supervision and begin disciplinary proceedings against those potentially responsible. Findings and sanctions must reflect each person's authority, knowledge, actions, and failures of duty, with due process and appeal.

Third strike: Require restructuring of the failed agency or dissolution with transfer of necessary services to a qualified successor, together with enforceable lawful removal of leaders found responsible. Replace the failed hierarchy while preserving competent staff, protecting whistleblowers, maintaining necessary services, and retaining records and applicable funding restrictions.

The agency's strike history survives resignations, reorganizations, and name changes. Resignation does not erase an individual's investigation, applicable penalties, or criminal prosecution when warranted. Institutional restructuring can be necessary even when an incoming leader is not personally at fault.

An incoming leader inherits the duty to fix the institution and its binding recovery plan, with the authority, resources, milestones, and deadlines needed to do so. They do not inherit the predecessor's guilt. A subsequent strike concerns failure to meet required correction milestones, not merely the discovery of inherited problems. Record who actually controlled each decision and whether superiors obstructed correction, withheld necessary authority, or blocked resources, so responsibility follows the people who could act.

Credible evidence of fraud, theft, knowing false accounting, concealment, or obstruction must be investigated immediately through lawful processes; investigators do not wait for three strikes. Criminal guilt requires proof of the relevant offense. Financial failure alone does not supply that proof, and the corrective process does not replace due process or appeal.

Implementation remains open: exact material-financial-failure and serious or repeated legal-violation thresholds, evidence, measurement periods, deadlines, fiscal-year rules, recovery and reset conditions, deciding and enforcement authorities, and the required statutory or constitutional changes. The three-stage model is a selected project direction, not a statement that current law already permits every proposed remedy.

Approve responsibilities and funding together

Selected direction: Approve an agency's required work and its funding together. Agencies must present credible costs drawn from actual staffing, spending, prices and explicit assumptions. Historical spending is evidence to examine, not proof that every expense is necessary. A lower approved budget must identify real savings or change the required work; it cannot silently leave the same obligations unfunded.

Required decision record: Preserve the work required, cost evidence and assumptions, approved funds, reasons for changes, savings or revised scope, warnings, named signoffs and legislative votes. This establishes what was known and who had authority. A warning is not automatic immunity, and a signature or vote alone does not establish guilt. Attribute consequences through evidence of cause, authority, knowledge and conduct.

Oversight clarification: Use existing audit and oversight institutions to review the evidence and responsibility. No universal new independent budget-approval layer is selected. Independent verification of a qualifying failure remains part of the three-strikes model; it is distinct from requiring a new institution to approve every budget.

Working controls during the year: Track obligations already incurred, current spending and expected remaining costs. Approve necessary changes before commitments exceed authorized resources. Report a credible shortfall promptly with options for additional funding, actual savings or revised requirements. The design of any temporary emergency exception to advance cost, funding or commitment approval remains unsettled; accounting and accountability still apply. These controls do not create a compulsory exception to personal tax direction.

Proposed emergency reserve and conditional employee payment

Working proposal: Provide an emergency reserve additional to agency operations, with a proposed target of 20% of the operating budget. Carry the reserve forward and replenish only the amount missing from the target. This is not a fresh additional 20% allocation regardless of the balance each year.

Selected distribution direction within the proposal: At year end, redistribute 50% of the unused reserve in equal dollar shares to every federal employee within that agency. Carry the other 50% forward. Equal portion means the same dollar amount for each employee, not a salary-weighted award or a management-only payment. Eligibility details still need drafting without quietly narrowing that direction.

Purpose and rejected alternative: The fund exists for emergencies. A payment is a conditional celebration when emergency funds happen to remain unused, not an expected or guaranteed annual bonus. The project explicitly rejected substituting a formula based only on verified efficiency savings. This reserve proposal is separate from the healthcare framework's verified-systemwide-savings conditions in Section 7; that healthcare decision remains unchanged.

Selected emergency definition: Use the federal budget definition in 2 U.S.C. 900(c)(20)–(21): an emergency requires new budget authority and spending to prevent, mitigate, or respond to loss of life or property, or a national-security threat. The situation must be unanticipated: sudden rather than developing over time, urgent enough to require immediate action, unforeseen as an emerging need, and temporary rather than

permanent. That statute supplies a definition within federal budget enforcement. America OS selects it as the basis for defining emergencies; it does not itself establish the proposed agency reserve, authorize employee payments, or decide reserve eligibility. Routine overruns do not automatically qualify. Source S11 below.

Safeguards to implement: Genuine emergency needs take priority over any potential employee payment. Before payout, existing audit and oversight must check outstanding obligations, required work and whether necessary spending has been deferred. Explicit nonretaliation protection and a reporting route outside the management chain are needed. An audit alone does not protect a reporter from retaliation.

Acknowledged incentive risks: Employees or managers could avoid legitimate reserve use, pad budget requests, defer necessary work or discourage reporting to preserve a payout. The proposed safeguards require enforceable design and do not prove those risks are eliminated. Distributing unused money also increases the next replenishment requirement; the payment must not be described as cost-free savings.

Illustration only: With an operating budget of 100 and a 20% reserve target of 20, an unused year-end reserve of 12 yields a payment pool of 6 and carryover of 6. Restoring the reserve to 20 requires 14, assuming the operating budget is unchanged. Initial operations plus the reserve are 120. This arithmetic illustrates the proposal, not an adopted monetary budget.

Open implementation: Define the exact operating-budget base, employee eligibility details, payout timing, caps, reserve access and approval, accounting for outstanding obligations, nonretaliation remedies, reporting channels, and legal authority for reserve carryover and payments. Cost the proposal and reconcile it with taxpayer directions, funding restrictions and necessary services. The target and mechanism remain under development; the selected emergency definition does not itself enact the reserve or resolve emergency-exception procedures.

Establish the cost of competent service

Selected direction: Determine what a community actually needs before deciding how much revenue to replace. Historical collections and approved budgets do not prove that every dollar is necessary. Examine actual spending, service results, overhead, inefficient contracts, fraud, and neglected maintenance.

Working proposal: Residents define desired service levels within constitutional rights. Reviewers then estimate the full cost of competent delivery, compare equivalent services in similar communities, and test public and private alternatives. Include maintenance, equipment replacement, necessary administration, reserves, and legacy obligations rather than treating omitted costs as savings.

Distinguish proven fraud, questioned or improper payments, inefficient delivery, and legitimate disagreement about priorities. Test vendor ownership and conflicts, duplicate payments, prices, contract amendments, grant eligibility, and evidence of delivery. Publish findings, correction status, recovery amounts, and independently verified recurring savings. Financial audits test reliable reporting; performance audits test value and effectiveness. Neither guarantees the absence of all fraud.

A working funding calculation is the efficient cost of chosen services, maintenance, reserves, and legacy obligations, less dependable non-tax revenue. Only then determine the remaining funding requirement. Do not finance permanent commitments with speculative fraud recoveries or unverified automation savings.

Service delivery and outsourcing

Selected direction: Outsourcing is optional and should be considered only when it is more efficient. There is no presumption that a private company or nonprofit should administer government. Compare full costs, service quality, accountability, transition costs, and the ability to change providers. Public delivery remains appropriate where it performs better.

Privately administered funds and services require the same transparency, audit access, conflict controls, and enforceable performance standards as public administration. Forming a nonprofit does not itself grant taxing, legislative, or police powers.

6 Taxpayer direction and freedom of conscience

The ethical commitment

Selected direction: Every person should have the right to direct their own tax contribution. Being born into a system, living under its laws, or paying under legal obligation should not be treated as personal ethical approval of its expenditures.

Someone who wants to fund military spending may authorize their own contribution for that purpose. Their choice does not authorize another person's contribution. This principle applies even when individuals choose causes or public purposes others oppose.

The intended endpoint is full personal direction. An equal citizen budget vote does not satisfy that requirement because it allows a collective result to supersede an individual's choices. A token allocable percentage also falls short of the endpoint. No mandatory baseline or emergency override has been accepted.

Selected clarification: Each person continues to direct their own attributable tax dollars at every level, rather than an equal allocation-credit share of a pooled budget. The equal-points alternative was explicitly declined. A local majority's approval of a project does not authorize the contributions of residents who decline to fund it. Voluntary contributions to other communities remain possible; unequal wealth alone creates no duty to redistribute funds. Approval of a policy, permission for a project, and authorization of an individual's money are separate decisions. Higher contributions direct more of the contributor's own dollars without purchasing additional electoral votes or general governing authority.

The question of consent to taxation itself remains distinct. Giving instructions for the use of collected money does not retrospectively establish consent to its collection.

An accessible allocation account

Working proposal: Offer an IRS-linked allocation account, access during tax filing, paper forms, and assisted in-person participation. A separate route would serve people with attributable taxes who do not file an income tax return. Participation alongside elections could be an additional channel, kept separate from candidate ballots.

The account would show the contribution available for direction, its calculation, and the year affected. People assign 100% across clearly explained purposes and see both percentages and dollar amounts. Binding exclusions and more specific choices are needed where broad categories include activities a person rejects.

Current design sequence: Begin with broad funding categories while defining the government functions those categories support. Preserve the existing requirement for enforceable exclusions and more specific choices where needed to honor individual restrictions. Broad categories are the starting scope, not permission to conceal rejected activities. Allocation deadlines, commitment periods, changes, nonresponse, and unassigned balances remain open.

Distinguish domestic defense, foreign military aid, humanitarian relief, and civilian development. Explain shared administrative costs before authorization. Do not preselect substantive choices or interpret silence as

approval. Use one effective record per person and allocation cycle, with revisions allowed before a published deadline.

Define how joint liabilities are divided. Distinguish actual attributable tax liability from withholding and refunds. Income tax, employee payroll contributions, indirect taxes, employer contributions, and corporate taxes require explicit scope rules. Narrowing an initial implementation to one tax type must not be presented as complete control.

Building budgets from authorized dollars

A category's funding would equal the actual dollars assigned to it. Individual percentages are weighted by each person's attributable contribution, not averaged equally.

For example, directing 30% of a \$10,000 contribution to education assigns \$3,000. Another person directing 10% of \$5,000 assigns \$500. Together they authorize \$3,500 for education. Higher contributors direct more money under this model; that does not grant them extra electoral votes or legislative powers.

Government would administer the authorized funds within the specified purposes. Shortfalls must be disclosed. Program adjustments, further willing allocations, or an explicit reconsideration of the policy would be needed when funding is insufficient.

Selected clarification: Give people simple, understandable, unbiased information about the services their allocations support and the credible consequences of different choices. Explain evidence and uncertainty without assuming that every existing institution needs redesign or quietly steering people toward an official preferred allocation. After that information is provided, individual allocation choices still stand, including when credible information indicates that the allocation will probably leave some people without lifesaving care. Such a warning does not itself authorize a compulsory minimum, override, or transfer of a person's restricted contribution. The unresolved task is to develop workable funding and service arrangements within the selected consent principle; no rule making care entitlement proportional to a person's tax contribution has been selected.

Enforcing the choices

- Prohibit transfers, relabeling, and substitute funding that defeat an individual's restrictions.
- Address borrowing and repayment so future debt costs do not restore a rejected expenditure through another route.
- Include weapons, equipment, existing stocks, and replacement costs in military-aid accounting, with valuation rules preventing double counting.
- Define mixed-purpose programs, overhead, and shared infrastructure so a broad category cannot conceal excluded activity.
- Establish a lawful treatment of unassigned balances; a holding account must not quietly finance general spending.
- Track restricted balances and spending permissions. Do not claim that physically identifiable dollars can be followed through pooled Treasury cash.
- Provide independent audits, correction and appeal procedures, and remedies for violations.

Historic expenditures and legacy assets cannot simply be reassigned retroactively. Treatment of existing obligations and revenue that cannot reliably be attributed to an individual remains open.

Transparency that citizens can understand

Begin with a private one-page allocation receipt: what was authorized, committed, paid, achieved, and left unspent. The public version aggregates choices and spending without exposing individual tax information or political preferences.

Allow people to move from that simple explanation to programs, recipients, contracts, grants, audit findings, and outcomes. Publish underlying records, definitions, category mappings, update dates, reconciliations, and revision histories so independent reviewers can verify the totals.

Explain differences between requested allocations, legally approved funding, commitments, and completed payments. Show shortfalls, uncertainty, and violations openly. The interface should help people understand consequences without quietly steering them toward an official preferred choice.

Tax bases and ownership

Selected direction: Eliminate recurring property taxes. The stated objection concerns continued payments to government merely to retain something already purchased. The discussion sought complete elimination, not only a primary-home exemption. Precise treatment of real estate, other taxable property, utility charges, special assessments, and existing tax liens remains to be drafted.

Selected direction: Prefer shifting most of the tax burden toward sales or consumption models, especially products with harmful effects such as cigarettes and alcohol. The federal income-tax strategy below now provides a specific selected reform alongside that preference. Complete income-tax abolition has not been adopted; an implementation schedule and complete replacement budget do not yet exist.

The project distinguished this distrust of current institutions from a categorical objection to every conceivable income tax: income taxation could be acceptable in an ideal system that works properly and gives people clear control of spending. The present design priority is to reduce government's unchecked fiscal power. No broad socialist or laissez-faire policy package has been adopted through that comparison.

Selected direction: Eliminate taxes on dividends and capital gains at every age, separately from the age-based relief for work and business income. The direction covers investments generally, superseding the earlier unresolved choice between primary residences, other real estate, and investments. This federal strategy does not by itself resolve state implementation or corporate-level taxation. Treatment of interest, rental income, crypto staking rewards, compensation paid in equity, and other income categories requires explicit classification; labeling a payment investment income does not settle its treatment.

Working safeguards: Prevent an abolished ownership tax from returning as a renamed recurring fee. Design any consumption tax around its total household burden, including effects on necessities and lower-income residents. Taxes on harmful products require evidence-based definitions, transparent rates, and review so that a broad concept of flourishing does not grant officials unlimited control over lawful choices.

If harmful-product purchases decline, associated receipts decline. Build that possibility into forecasts and do not make permanent services depend on continued harmful consumption. No sales-tax rates, exclusions, rebates, or revenue sufficiency claims have been adopted.

Federal income tax during early adulthood

Selected direction: Give each person a \$500,000 annual federal income-tax allowance for eligible employment compensation, net self-employment income, and qualifying personal business profits before age 30. The allowance resets each tax year and is shared across all qualifying jobs and businesses. It is not a

lifetime limit, and using it in one year does not reduce the following year's allowance. Unused allowance is not accumulated under this annual model.

Eligible income includes wages, salaries, bonuses, commissions, freelance and contract earnings, and an individual's qualifying share of business profit. Count business income after legitimate expenses, not gross sales. Count each amount once: contractor receipts that already enter net business profit do not receive a second allowance. W-2 and 1099 forms describe reporting channels; eligibility follows the underlying income even when no form is issued. Detailed treatment of business entities and owner participation remains to be drafted.

Selected direction: Before age 30, subtract the \$500,000 allowance from combined eligible annual income, with a floor of zero. Apply the ordinary progressive bracket structure to the excess starting with the lowest bracket. The exempt income does not occupy the lower brackets. A 24-year-old earning \$600,000 is therefore taxed as if earning \$100,000 under the otherwise applicable income-tax rules; someone earning \$500,000 or less owes no federal income tax on that eligible income. Crossing the allowance does not make the first \$500,000 taxable. Filing status, ordinary deductions, and credits must be coordinated so the same-income comparison is preserved without duplicate deductions.

Transition from age 30 through 35

Selected direction: Withdraw the tax savings gradually, using six equal steps beginning at age 30 and reaching ordinary income-tax treatment at age 35. Keep the \$500,000 annual reference allowance throughout the transition; taper the tax savings rather than shrinking the allowance.

- Under 30: full relief; pay only the ordinary tax calculated on eligible income above \$500,000.
- Age 30: restore one-sixth of the tax savings, approximately 16.67%.
- Age 31: restore two-sixths of the tax savings, approximately 33.33%.
- Age 32: restore three-sixths of the tax savings, or 50%.
- Age 33: restore four-sixths of the tax savings, approximately 66.67%.
- Age 34: restore five-sixths of the tax savings, approximately 83.33%.
- Age 35 onward: restore all of the tax savings; the youth allowance no longer reduces income tax.

For eligible income at or below \$500,000, the restored fraction is the share of the otherwise applicable income-tax bill that becomes payable. These percentages are shares of a tax bill, not tax rates on income. Use the exact fractions in calculations rather than the rounded percentages.

For eligible income above \$500,000, first calculate the ordinary tax on the excess and the ordinary tax on total eligible income under consistent filing, deduction, and credit rules. The difference is the full youth tax saving. During the taper, pay the tax on the excess plus the age-specific fraction of that difference. For example, at age 32 with \$600,000 of eligible income, pay the ordinary tax calculated as if earning \$100,000 plus half the difference between the ordinary bills on \$600,000 and \$100,000. This preserves the selected bracket treatment and reaches the ordinary full-income bill at 35.

Scope funding and implementation questions

Selected scope: This change concerns personal federal income tax. Social Security and Medicare payroll taxes, including their self-employment counterparts, are separate issues deferred for later discussion. The policy does not eliminate those taxes, alter benefits, or decide employer contributions. Personal business-profit relief does not automatically abolish corporate income tax.

State preference remains provisional: The project favors considering the same treatment at the state level. No state exemption, mandatory state conformity, or local income-tax change has been adopted. Resolve those choices against the responsibilities and revenue needs of the redesigned governments.

Open administration: Define how age is measured in a birthday year; citizenship and residency eligibility; joint returns and spouses of different ages; business losses and mixed income; existing credits, deductions, and alternative tax calculations; withholding and estimated payments; and whether the \$500,000 allowance is indexed to inflation. Set an effective date and a transition for people already aged 30 through 34. The policy has no adopted retroactive application.

Open business and investment boundaries: Coordinate work income, personal business profits, corporate taxation, and the separate dividend and capital-gains exemption. Address income assigned to younger relatives, income shifted across birthdays, and compensation relabeled as investment returns while preserving legitimate ownership and investment. Specific safeguards remain to be designed.

Purpose and evaluation: The intended benefits are earlier savings, business creation, investment, homeownership, and greater freedom to form families. Additional work, earlier marriage or parenthood, and lower housing prices are hypotheses to evaluate, not guaranteed outcomes. Estimate revenue effects and household benefits across ages and earnings, including the transition at 35. Combine the estimate with property-tax elimination and investment-income reform; identify actual spending changes or replacement revenue without assuming growth or unverified fraud savings pays for the policy. Existing accountability, taxpayer-direction, and local development-control commitments remain applicable.

Resident direction and voluntary community funding

Working proposals: Extend personal allocation accounts to the relevant local government and any agreed shared services. Publish costed service proposals, providers, maintenance needs, minimum funding levels, and delivery milestones. Restricted contributions could be held until a project is viable, with disclosed return or reallocation rules. Willing residents could make multiyear commitments for continuing services.

Voluntary donations, community nonprofits, commercial earnings, and endowments may supplement or reduce tax requirements. Nonprofits could administer restricted funds or deliver services if the efficiency test is met. Larger contributions must not buy regulatory privileges or additional electoral rights. Controls must prevent steering contributions to one's own business or receiving private benefits disguised as public spending.

These options remain exploratory. Participatory budgeting typically lets residents vote collectively on public spending; that does not satisfy the project's distinct endpoint of personal control over each person's contribution. Choosing the use of a compulsory payment also differs from choosing whether to contribute at all.

Open decisions: Determine how sales and excise taxes would be attributed to people without unnecessary purchase surveillance, how nonresponse is handled, and how restricted balances are reconciled. Resolve funding shortfalls for ongoing services while preserving the no-bailout and individual-consent principles. Voluntary commitments and reserves improve predictability but do not prove sufficient funding.

Community investment funds and commercial activity need genuine sources of capital and net earnings. Private infrastructure financing normally requires repayment from fees, revenue, or public payments. Investment risk, management costs, inflation, and the income surrendered when selling a public asset must be included. No specific asset sale or investment strategy has been adopted.

7 State stewardship and practical public services

Selected direction: Give states a tangible role in improving wellbeing through shared systems and useful capabilities, without reclaiming local policymaking.

Food and agricultural resilience

Monitor food supply, soil health, crop threats, processing and storage capacity, distribution, and water use. Support the transition to regenerative agriculture as the agricultural foundation through research, demonstration projects, seed banks, scientific testing, and voluntary technical assistance. Connect urban demand with rural producers and improve shared processing and cold-storage infrastructure. Section 8 sets out the broader environmental and agricultural commitments.

Waste and materials

Map material flows and coordinate recycling, composting, hazardous-waste treatment, wastewater recovery, and other shared facilities. Research new recovery technologies and connect reusable waste streams with businesses that can use them. Evaluate results rather than requiring every community to adopt the same solution.

Research and shared capability

A proposed State Extension and Innovation Service would connect engineers, agricultural scientists, public-health specialists, economists, ecologists, universities, businesses, and inventors. It would identify problems, run voluntary pilots, publish findings, and help successful approaches spread.

Optional shared services could include laboratories, cybersecurity, engineering, procurement, payroll, data hosting, legal expertise, forensic support, emergency communications, training, and equipment pools. A local government can purchase technical services while retaining control of policy.

Limits on intervention

Research and technical assistance should not carry unrelated policy conditions. Mandatory state intervention would need a material cross-boundary effect, necessity, a limited scope, and review. These functions require funding arrangements compatible with the broader fiscal framework and the newer consent principle.

Healthcare starting framework

Selected direction: Pay for readiness, fund necessary care, and reward verified health. Seek the lowest sustainable total cost consistent with necessary care, access, safety, and preparedness. Pursue both resource efficiency and constraints on excessive prices. A lower bill achieved by withholding needed care, shifting costs elsewhere, or weakening future capacity does not satisfy this objective.

Readiness and necessary care

Selected direction: Fund readiness separately from routine care, against independently verified capability. Include appropriate staffing, equipment and its maintenance, reserves, drills, and regional and national backup. Define realistic risks and service standards; preparedness is not a promise that every facility can independently handle every possible event.

Selected direction: Use population care budgets adjusted for people's needs, with stable, competitive clinician salaries. Payment should support necessary care without automatically making more procedures more profitable. Independent review and additional funding must be available when necessary care exceeds

a local budget. A catastrophic-risk pool should protect against unusually costly needs; exhausting a local budget must not automatically result in denial.

Verified outcomes and savings

Selected direction: Reward independently verified improvements in health, function, and safety, with attention to durable results. For people with chronic illness or disability, maintaining health or function and preventing deterioration are valid successes. The standard cannot require curing everyone. Better health can deserve a reward before it produces financial savings.

Selected direction: Share only verified systemwide net savings after quality, access, and safety requirements have been met. Allocate part to staff rewards and reinvestment and part to reducing future premiums or tax-funding needs. Count the costs of delivering improvements and maintaining readiness; moving expenses to patients, other providers, or another public budget is not a saving. No percentage or numerical split has been selected.

Selected direction: Use independently established prospective benchmarks that reflect care needs and sustainable efficient delivery. Inflated historical prices and diagnosis-coding changes must not manufacture apparent savings or success. Prevent patient selection and cost shifting. Hold back part of bonuses until longer-term outcomes can be checked, and support prevention through multiyear investment rather than requiring an immediate annual return.

Patient protection and independent review

Selected direction: Protect meaningful patient access, provider choice, and appeals. Monitor waiting times, unmet needs, necessary follow-up, and outcomes for people who leave a provider or care arrangement. Fewer return visits alone do not establish success: they may reflect better health, lost access, or incomplete care. Evaluate which explanation the evidence supports.

Selected direction: Measure harm independently through patient follow-up and record review rather than relying only on an institution's own incident reports. Protect honest reporting and learning while holding concealment and reckless conduct accountable. Measures and incentives must reward safer care rather than make hiding adverse events financially attractive.

Decisions still open

Open decisions: Choose the public, private, nonprofit, or mixed ownership and delivery arrangement; the roles of insurers; and the division of local, state, regional, and federal administration, funding, research, oversight, and appeals. Placement in this section does not select state control of the entire healthcare system. Develop the selected federal research priority in Section 3, including independent research on important underserved questions, without assuming a particular institution or transferring all health funding to one level.

Open decisions: Cost the necessary-care budgets, readiness standards, catastrophic-risk pool, additional-funding review, clinician compensation, outcome rewards, and prevention investment. Select risk-adjustment methods, prospective benchmarks, independent evaluators, quality and access thresholds, bonus deferral periods, savings allocation, and protections against gaming. The earlier hypothetical budget and reward figures illustrate the approach only; they are not an adopted formula.

Open decisions: Define eligibility, covered care, patient costs, choice and appeal procedures, legal authority, transition arrangements, and the evidence needed to test the model. Reconcile reliable healthcare funding and shared risk with individual tax direction, the no-bailout principle, and existing obligations in Sections 5

and 6. This foundation does not create an unapproved compulsory exception, settle Medicare or payroll-tax reform, or establish that savings will cover all costs.

Further healthcare development

Development agenda: Continue examining affordable care and insurance with meaningful provider choice; prevention through diet, exercise, and mental healthcare; humane healing facilities and connection with nature; pharmaceutical research conflicts and liability incentives; and supplement purity and standardization. These concerns guide inquiry rather than establish blanket coverage, a specific regulatory program, or an assumption that every proposed intervention works.

Evaluate benefits, harms, evidence quality, incentives, and alternatives for each proposal. Claims about the safety of natural products, clinicians' knowledge, treatment harms, or pharmaceutical motives require evidence and must not become blanket factual premises. Preserve successful arrangements and compare targeted improvements with broader redesign under the inquiry method in Section 2.

Pharmaceutical advertising

Selected direction: End pharmaceutical advertising. Define the scope before implementation: the discussion has not settled whether this means direct-to-consumer prescription-drug advertising or all pharmaceutical advertising. Covered products, audiences, media, exceptions, legal authority, and transition remain open; this direction is separate from election advertising.

8 Ecosystem enhancement agriculture and residential stewardship

Restore whole ecosystems

Selected direction: Make ecosystem enhancement a core objective of America OS. Soil health is one essential part of a holistic approach that also cleans waterways, restores substantial areas of native fields and forests, supports native species, and reduces invasive species as far as practicable.

The goal is to leave living systems healthier, more resilient, and better able to sustain future generations. Regenerative agriculture is one expression of this broader commitment. Food production, residential land, waterways, and habitat restoration all belong within it.

Working proposals: Coordinate watershed restoration, wildlife corridors, pollinator protection, community stewardship, and science-based invasive-species control. A proposed ecosystem enhancement index and annual natural-capital report would track changes in biodiversity, water quality, soil condition, and resilient working lands. Measures, baselines, targets, and audit methods remain to be designed; no single score or numeric target has been adopted.

Regenerative agriculture as the foundation

Selected direction: Establish regenerative agriculture as the foundation of the agricultural system, with healthy soil treated as critical infrastructure. Agricultural success should include long-term fertility, water retention, biodiversity, and the quality and nutritional value of food alongside productive capacity.

Working proposals: Redirect agricultural incentives toward measurable ecological improvements; provide transition cost sharing and technical help; prioritize public research and extension; and give regenerative producers a fair opportunity in public procurement. Soil carbon, water quality, and biodiversity were proposed outcome measures. The specific standards must account for regional conditions and avoid making one practice a universal substitute for demonstrated results.

Transition timing, eligibility, verification costs, research priorities, and the balance between incentives and requirements remain open. Research and evaluation should test nutritional and ecological outcomes.

Seeds as a commons and enforceable farmer rights

Selected direction: Seeds should not be subject to exclusive private control that prevents farmers from planting, saving, storing, and replanting them. Reform or repeal laws that conflict with the seed-commons principle and enact affirmative farmer protections.

The policy must extend beyond naturally occurring genetics. The discussion explicitly rejected a loophole in which control over genetically modified seeds, restrictive contracts, or market manipulation achieves the same dependency. Protect farmers' autonomy regardless of how a seed variety was developed.

Working proposals: A Farmer Rights Act would establish non-waivable rights to save, breed, and replant seed. A Seed Commons Act would address exclusive genetic ownership and support public seed banks and open breeding. Precise treatment of existing patents, plant-variety rights, licenses, and contracts requires a legal inventory and transition plan. Physical possession and sale of seed stocks must be distinguished from exclusive control over reproduction and access; the final ownership definitions remain open.

Agricultural competition and corporate accountability

Selected direction: Prevent monopoly control of the seed and food supply, protect farmers from coercive dependency, and impose meaningful consequences for proven abuses. The discussion specifically called for dismantling Monsanto and holding responsible executives criminally accountable; those are requested accountability objectives, not findings of guilt or a determination of applicable charges.

Working proposals: An independent truth and accountability commission could investigate alleged harms, obtain evidence through defined powers, identify legal gaps, and refer evidence of existing offenses to the proper authorities. Structural antitrust remedies, including divestiture or breakup where legally justified, would address concentrated control. Criminal charges and personal liability require evidence, applicable law, and due process. Prospective reform must not invent retroactive crimes.

An Agricultural Competition Act could establish structural market limits. A proposed food-sovereignty review body could assess mergers, regulations, and policies for their effects on farmer autonomy, resilience, and public interest. A compensation mechanism for demonstrable farmer harm and transparent safety-data requirements were also discussed. Institutional design, market thresholds, funding, and remedies remain open; allegations are not substitutes for an investigation.

Later clarification: Criminal conviction is not a prerequisite for examining business consequences, identifying responsible decision-makers, or demanding changes to harmful practices. The earlier request for criminal accountability remains subject to evidence, applicable law, and due process. The broader consequence-based framework in Section 12 also applies to agriculture. The existing glyphosate-ban direction remains recorded separately from the evidentiary assessment of particular health claims or individual responsibility.

Glyphosate and related pesticide restrictions

Selected direction: Adopt a complete ban on glyphosate and on the additional similar pesticides defined by the policy. The original commitment is a ban; the discussion of a transition or phaseout concerns implementation rather than replacing that endpoint with voluntary reduction.

Open decisions: Define which additional substances and uses are covered, the effective date, handling of existing stocks, enforcement, and any proposed exceptions. No precise chemical list, deadline, or exception

has been adopted. Independent long-term safety testing, transparent evidence, farmer transition assistance, and assessment of alternative methods are working implementation proposals.

Reward native residential ecosystems and home gardens

Selected direction: Incentivize and reward residents who replace conventional lawns with thriving native ecosystems and food-growing landscapes in front and back yards. Public education should help people recognize well-stewarded, living landscapes as desirable and understand their contribution to ecological regeneration.

Working proposals: A habitat-stewardship program could offer credits or rebates for verified native plantings, rain gardens, tree canopy, and food-producing landscapes. Design templates, local extension assistance, neighborhood recognition, and optional reporting of restored habitat could make participation accessible and visible. No rebate amount, tax-credit formula, or mandatory reporting requirement has been selected.

Eligibility should recognize intentional stewardship and measurable ecological outcomes. Simply stopping mowing would not automatically establish that a property is restoring native habitat. Standards should distinguish restoration from unmanaged hazards and invasive growth without reinstating conventional-lawn aesthetics as the test.

Protect regenerative landscaping from HOA penalties

Selected direction: Give residents an enforceable right to practice regenerative landscaping without HOA punishment for protected native plantings, home gardens, or food forests. Conflicting HOA restrictions should not defeat that right merely because a landscape differs from a conventional lawn.

Working proposals: Legislation would make conflicting restrictions unenforceable and provide a clear remedy against improper fines or other penalties. HOAs could retain narrowly defined, content-neutral safety rules concerning clear sidewalks, sight lines, and actual noxious weeds. A simple certification could document qualifying regenerative landscapes and provide protection from conflicting covenants and access to incentives.

Certification criteria, administration, appeals, and the legal level at which these protections apply remain open. The protection should concern the landscaping practices themselves; it is not a general exemption from unrelated HOA obligations.

Personal resource use and household self sufficiency

Proposed direction: Protect people's ability to collect rooftop rainwater, use sunlight for energy, grow food, and responsibly use wood and other resources they lawfully own. Review laws, ordinances, and HOA restrictions that obstruct these activities without adequate justification. This extends the existing native-landscape and home-garden commitments. The requested broad exemption for resources on private land, with protected zones as the only exception, is recorded for evaluation rather than adopted as an unlimited extraction right.

Recommended safeguard: Restrictions must address a demonstrable material risk to others, public health, shared water, protected rights, or ecological systems, using proportionate measures and accessible appeal. A protected-zone designation cannot be the only trigger: pollution, erosion, aquifer depletion, and downstream harm can originate outside such zones. Surface ownership does not always include mineral or water rights. Existing third-party rights, easements, tribal rights, and conservation obligations require explicit treatment rather than automatic extinguishment.

Working proposal: Establish a simple protected category for ordinary household solar, rooftop rainwater collection, gardens, and small-scale responsible resource use, with objective safety standards and prompt review of disputed restrictions. Evaluate cumulative watershed effects when setting locally appropriate thresholds. Large diversions, commercial mining, drilling, dams, and extensive clearing receive separate impact review. Modest rainwater collection should not be regulated as though it were a commercial diversion. Colorado already permits qualifying residential rain barrels totaling 110 gallons and has other qualifying collection pathways; restrictions are not a universal national ban. Source S7.

Open decision: Define the protected household category and its relationship to residents' development votes in Section 12. Recommended approach: an ordinary protected household use cannot be vetoed solely for aesthetics or preference; consequential commercial development remains subject to the agreed development process and common rights floor. State enactments can start this reform. A uniform national right requires an adequate constitutional basis or constitutional amendment, consistent with the limited federal model.

Fit with autonomy and taxpayer consent

Open decisions: Determine which farmer and residential-landscape protections belong in the common rights floor, which ecological responsibilities concern shared state systems, and which choices remain with local communities. Broad national standards must have an explicit place in the limited-power framework.

Regeneration grants, public seed banks, research, transition aid, rebates, and compensation programs all require transparent funding designs. The environmental commitments do not establish a new compulsory exception to individual tax direction. Corporate liability payments must be distinguished from public subsidies, and any tax credit must make its effect on other revenues visible.

9 Federal protection and cooperative investigation

Selected direction: Maintain federal expertise capable of identifying serious threats to life and property and assisting regions that lack the capacity to investigate major crimes.

High-level analysis could identify terrorism, foreign interference, trafficking, organized crime, cyberattacks, coordinated violence, infrastructure threats, multijurisdictional crime, and serious public corruption. Analysis should focus on credible threats rather than lawful dissent or unpopular beliefs.

Federal assistance could provide specialized investigators, laboratories, financial tracing, behavioral analysis, cybersecurity, intelligence coordination, search resources, and witness protection. The project's preferred relationship is cooperation and assistance, with local authorities retaining their role.

Open decision: Define when independent federal jurisdiction, implicated local officials, or constitutional-rights enforcement could justify federal leadership. Earlier proposed exceptions must not silently turn assistance into a general takeover power.

Open decision: Define which cross-border crimes call for federal investigation or prosecution, what local and state authorities retain, and how cooperation, evidence sharing, jurisdictional conflicts, and rights review work. The October 10 discussion raised these questions without adopting an automatic federal takeover rule.

Working safeguards include lawful authorization for individualized surveillance, data minimization, purpose and retention limits, access logs, independent inspection, legislative and judicial oversight, and consequences for political misuse.

10 Artificial intelligence and public capability

Working proposals: The project requested an AI strategy and developed the following package. The specific institutions, mandates, funding, and remedies remain proposals for adoption and refinement.

Civic intelligence and public outcomes

A State Civic Intelligence and Resilience Service could monitor food, water, energy, housing, transportation, public health, workforce needs, and supply chains; identify risks; test scenarios; and publish assumptions and uncertainty.

A Public Outcomes Observatory could compare cost of living, housing availability, learning outcomes, economic activity, public safety, infrastructure, environmental quality, health, fiscal condition, processing times, and citizen satisfaction. Measurement should inform citizens without ideological ratings or personal social scoring.

Public AI tools and assistance

A Public AI Commons could provide secure computing, model testing, cybersecurity, technical staff, procurement support, public datasets, audits, and training accessible to smaller local governments.

An optional civic assistant could help individuals understand laws, taxes, budgets, benefits, permits, education and healthcare options, business requirements, appeals, and public participation. It should cite sources, acknowledge uncertainty, and provide access to a human. It would have no independent authority to punish, deny, investigate, or classify a person.

Human authority and due process

AI may assist public decisions but should not exercise sovereign authority. For consequential government decisions, proposed rights include notice of AI use, an understandable explanation, correction of relevant personal data, meaningful human review, independent appeal, challenges to reliability or legality, and remedies for unlawful or negligent harm.

AI-generated suspicion alone should not establish guilt or substitute for a lawful evidentiary process. Human review must be meaningful, not automatic approval of a machine's output.

Responsibilities at each level

Federal responsibilities would cover genuinely national threats, high-risk safety standards, rights protections, interstate fraud and competition issues, critical infrastructure, incident reporting, and authentication of official communications. The scope must remain compatible with limited federal power.

States would provide shared infrastructure, independent testing, procurement and data standards, forecasting, training, research, and coordination of energy and water impacts. Local governments would decide local deployment in schools, healthcare administration, policing, permitting, transit, waste services, and staffing within applicable rights protections.

Privacy and independent oversight

Prefer aggregated or de-identified information, local data retention, limited-purpose access, and short retention periods. Individual investigations require lawful grounds and appropriate authorization. Prohibit generalized government social scores based on lawful beliefs, associations, purchases, travel, or speech.

Register consequential government AI systems and disclose their purpose, operator, supplier, data categories, limitations, relevant error rates, cost, review procedures, incidents, complaints, and renewal decisions. High-risk deployments should undergo independent testing before use and periodically afterward.

Vendor independence and infrastructure costs

Require portable data, usable exports, interoperable formats, audit access, security testing, migration plans, subcontractor disclosure, and continuity of public records. Government data should not become unrelated model-training material without authorization.

Coordinate data-center impacts on shared water, energy, communications, and emergency systems. The proposal assigns reasonably attributable infrastructure costs to the operator, preventing hidden subsidies through residents' utility bills. Siting and shared-system authority need clear local-state boundaries.

Work and public returns

An AI Transition and Skills Service could provide literacy training, retraining, portable credentials, apprenticeships, career support, small-business assistance, worker-owned business support, and access to tools.

Measure net savings and productivity from public automation. Previously discussed uses include lower taxes or fees, debt reduction, better services, reserves, training, shorter public-sector workweeks without reduced service, and local productivity dividends. No fixed allocation or universal dividend has been adopted. These uses must be reconciled with individual direction of contributions and residual balances.

Mobility between communities

Maintain secure portability of identity records, educational transcripts, credentials, pensions, court records, medical information, business records, vehicle and property records, and earned benefits. Different local laws should not require citizens to rebuild their administrative lives whenever they move.

11 Elections term limits and federal representation

Term limits and Senate election timing

Selected direction: Establish term limits using a reasoned standard and make elected institutions responsive to the people. The project favors Senate elections alongside presidential elections, implying four-year Senate terms.

Electing all senators in the same four-year cycle was the latest working model. A three-term Senate cap of 12 years was suggested, not explicitly finalized. Earlier six-year Senate terms and an 18-year Senate cap should not be carried forward as the chosen design.

Other term-limit proposals discussed include a 12-year House cap, a lifetime combined congressional-service cap, six-year leadership limits, and precise treatment of partial terms. The lifetime cap needs reconsideration alongside four-year Senate terms; no final package has been adopted.

Majority winning elections

Working proposal: Consider majority-winning elections through ranked choice or runoffs. This is a separate electoral-method question, not a term-limit rule or a qualification threshold. The final method, applicable offices, counting, ties, appeals, and transition remain open. Open inquiry requested October 12: How should election winners be chosen, what role should the Electoral College have, and how should electoral districts

be drawn while preventing gerrymandering? No preferred winner-selection method, Electoral College change, or district-drawing solution has been selected.

Supporting reforms include competitive electoral boundaries, conflict and gift rules, post-service lobbying restrictions, and strong nonpartisan legislative research staff. The newer political-money and politician-investment directions are recorded in Section 13; their scope and enforcement remain to be designed.

Candidate qualification

Selected direction: Use exclusive individual endorsements as the primary qualification criterion, with support from a minimum number of unique verified donors as a secondary criterion. Each person may endorse one candidate per race within a single declared qualification window and deadline. Donors may contribute any positive amount; no minimum dollar donation is required. Count people rather than repeated donations as separate supporters. **Selected clarification:** Every candidate, including a late entrant, must meet these same exclusive-endorsement and unique-verified-donor criteria to appear on the ballot. Late entry creates no lower-threshold exemption.

Open decisions: Set the endorsement threshold and electorate denominator, donor-count minimum or ratio to endorsements, verification, appeals, ties, and treatment of low participation. A field of at most ten was offered as a desired example, not a finalized numerical rule. The suggested 10% threshold and a right to change endorsements until the deadline remain proposals. The same support criteria apply to ballot access for all candidates, including late entrants; receiving the initial grant and debate opportunity also depends on the working campaign schedule. Resolve the remaining lawful qualification time and the practical availability of exclusive endorsements. No final late-entry deadline, endorsement-transfer right, or absolute ban is adopted.

Equal starting resources and campaign funding

Working campaign sequence: Candidates declare by a published deadline, qualify, receive equal starting grants, and participate in one to three initial debates featuring all qualifying candidates. They may then raise additional individual campaign contributions at their own pace up to a common ceiling. Equal starting resources do not require identical final spending. Late entrants would miss the grant and initial debates under this proposal, and must still meet the same endorsement and unique-donor criteria as other ballot candidates. A late entrant may seek enough support in the remaining lawful time or wait until another election; difficulty qualifying does not create an exemption.

Working funding option: Individual contributions could first support a shared starting-resources fund and later flow to a donor's chosen candidate. Pool sufficiency, allocation timing, grant amounts, the campaign ceiling, administration, and any return of unused money are unresolved. No compulsory tax-funded baseline is adopted. A familiar, repeatable framework should inform state and local elections while leaving their detailed design to states and communities.

Official candidate information

Selected direction: Provide an official, easily searchable federal candidate website covering everyone who meets the initial qualifying criteria. Present positions on important policies in understandable language, together with actual voting records where available. Offer optional matching between a person's stated beliefs and candidates' positions. This is a government civic-information proposal, separate from the America OS project website.

Working safeguards: Publish sources and matching methods, let users control issue weights, distinguish missing information from disagreement, protect private preferences, and provide correction and appeal.

Qualification rules, administration, coverage of candidates without voting records, the scoring method, accessibility, and independent oversight remain open. No opaque score should be presented as an objective instruction about whom to support.

Digital participation and election security

Selected goal: Enable digital, online and ultimately paperless participation from wherever people are, including verified digital endorsements and remote election participation. Verify identity and citizenship for eligible citizens' electoral participation. The request for a familiar state and local framework does not settle eligibility for every government service or merge identity records with ballot choices.

Open implementation: No secure remote-voting system has been selected or demonstrated. Blockchain, cybersecurity monitoring, built-in failsafes, and AI analysis were raised as possible technologies, not established solutions. Independent security evaluation, ballot secrecy, coercion resistance, verifiability, accessibility, recovery, and resilience must be resolved before deployment. The paperless goal does not establish that today's safeguards can safely be removed. Digital identity, candidate endorsements, tax allocation, and secret voting require distinct privacy and security designs.

A path to Senate representation

Selected direction: Local autonomy or a governmental merger should not automatically create new Senate seats. The later discussion replaced the initial two-senators-per-new-district idea with an earned path to direct federal representation.

A proposed Federal Commonwealth status would recognize a qualifying jurisdiction's demonstrated maturity and contribution to the republic. Candidate criteria included durable self-government, population, fiscal reliability, constitutional-rights compliance, independent courts and elections, audited accounts, satisfied shared obligations, and settled boundaries.

Twenty years of autonomy, ten years without default, and a 75% referendum were suggested examples, not finalized thresholds. The qualifying contribution, representation formula, certification procedure, and legal transition remain open. A person should not receive overlapping Senate votes in both an elevated jurisdiction and its former parent jurisdiction. The change from universal districts to protected local governments requires a fresh definition of eligible jurisdictions; no city, township, or rural district automatically gains Federal Commonwealth status under the revised framework.

Public compensation tied to ordinary earnings

Selected direction: Federal legislators' pay should use national median worker earnings adjusted for regional prices in the state they represent. State officials' pay should use state worker earnings and local officials' pay should use local worker earnings. The aim is the ordinary worker's living standard, public-service accountability, and no arbitrary premium. Earnings are income from work, not household wealth or net worth. The exact worker population and statistical series remain open.

The earlier proposal for one unadjusted national rate based on 52 times median weekly earnings is superseded by the selected national-median baseline with represented-state price adjustment. Choose an annual earnings measure, regional-price measure, reference period, publication lag, update cadence, and calculation rules. Full-time, year-round workers including self-employed people were recommended as one population, not adopted. Treatment of federal offices without a represented state, including the President, remains open.

Earlier illustration only: The September 25 discussion used a second-quarter 2026 weekly-earnings figure of \$1,251, annualized to \$65,052. That example is not a selected salary or the current formula, excludes self-employed workers, and cannot substitute for the annual benchmark and regional-price adjustment now being designed. Source S1 preserves the original research reference.

Working safeguards: Publish the exact inputs, calculation code, definitions, sampling uncertainty, archived releases, and revision history. Provide independent replication using privacy-protected data and secure access where confidentiality prevents full public replication. Use Census and administrative earnings data as cross-checks, not competing figures officials can choose from. Protect statistical staff from political interference and retaliation. Independent auditors should review computation and methodology; they cannot guarantee incorruptibility.

Working safeguards: Methodology changes should have public reasons, expert review, a comment period, and parallel publication under old and new methods where practicable. A last-certified-amount fallback and prospective corrections are options, not finalized rules. The legal route, including the Twenty-Seventh Amendment and treatment of recurring adjustments, requires review. Source S2 supplies constitutional context.

Working access and integrity safeguards: Address paid outside employment, disguised gifts or compensation, investment conflicts, and financial disclosure. Distinguish salary from necessary audited work expenses such as official travel, lodging, staff, and security; benefits, retirement, allowances, and expense rules are not finalized. Median-linked pay alone does not make an independently wealthy official live on median resources. No confiscation of existing assets, spouse-income ban, or personal spending ceiling has been adopted.

Open decisions: Resolve the worker population, regional-price calculation, state and local statistical coverage, update schedule, benefits and expenses, investment rules, independent review, transition, and legal authority. Comparing mean, median, and mode was proposed as research, but does not replace the selected median baseline. Pay linkage is an accountability objective, not evidence that officials will cause wages to rise or that pay reductions alone cure corruption.

12 Economic policy housing and questions under exploration

Poverty reduction and contribution

Selected direction: Human flourishing should extend across communities, including practical efforts to help people leave poverty. The commitment does not depend on assuming equal motivation, participation, or civic concern in every community, and the project rejects treating that assumption as an established fact.

Selected direction: Expect people who can contribute to work toward their own improvement. The project does not endorse automatic equity-based treatment or guaranteed equal outcomes as the implication of a universal flourishing goal.

Selected direction: Communities may differ in wealth, services, culture, and outcomes. Greater wealth alone creates no general duty to solve another community's poverty. Assistance between communities is voluntary unless a separately established obligation applies. The aim is to improve opportunities for residents to work toward collective improvement, not to force equal resources or outcomes. The existing distinctions concerning emergencies, rights protection, agreed obligations, and financial bailouts remain in Section 5.

Open decisions: Define contribution, access to work and skills, and the treatment of disability, childhood, caregiving, unemployment despite effort, and other constraints. No specific work test, benefit sanction,

assistance entitlement, or exclusion from essential services has been selected. Avoid turning unmeasured beliefs about a community's motivation into policy facts.

Residential ownership and affordability

Selected direction: Reserve residential ownership for individual citizens rather than institutional or large corporate portfolio ownership. Impose a meaningful ownership cap and require affected large holders to divest. The intent is to release homes for individual purchase and substantially lower homeownership costs.

About 20 residential homes or units was suggested as a starting number, not adopted as a final cap. The project explicitly rejects treating 5,000 homes as an acceptable threshold. A research definition of institutional ownership must not become the policy standard by default.

Selected direction: Pursue a much larger affordability change than a modest 5% correction. The project proposed a reduction on the order of 50% in home values and accepts that a major transition could cause temporary disruption and leave some borrowers with mortgages exceeding their homes' value. The exact target market, price or monthly-cost measure, timeline, and treatment of affected borrowers remain open. This records the ambition and acknowledged tradeoff; it is not a forecast of the policy's effect.

The project's economic rationale is that releasing large portfolios increases homes offered for sale and places downward pressure on prices. The scale and duration of that effect require local ownership and market data. More listings and more total dwellings are different measures; occupied rentals released for sale still house people. The discussion has not settled the effects on renters, credit access, construction, or the ability of individuals to finance purchases. No claim that forced divestment alone will produce a 50% nationwide reduction has been validated.

Open decisions: Define beneficial ownership across related entities and family arrangements; whether a cap applies per person, household, local jurisdiction, or nationally; treatment of apartments, resident cooperatives, nonprofits, trusts, construction inventory, inheritance, and temporary lender ownership; and the distinction between ownership and property management. Determine divestment deadlines, tenant protections and purchase opportunities, enforcement, anti-evasion rules, and the legal route. No exemptions or new-construction requirements have been adopted.

Resident control of development and community character

Selected direction: Residents must have effective, binding authority to approve or reject consequential private development in their community. A majority may oppose a project even when it would add housing or investment. Residents must also be able to approve change they want. Public comment followed by unchecked official discretion does not fulfill this commitment.

Community character, aesthetics, slower growth, and locally chosen development patterns are legitimate priorities. A community is not required to accommodate every proposed project or provide universally accessible or affordable housing. No mandatory local affordable-housing quota or general duty to subsidize another community has been adopted. The government implements decisions through an accountable legal process; merely transferring more power to a city council is insufficient.

Selected direction: Broad housing-affordability ambitions do not override local development choice. Some communities may remain expensive and exclusive in price. Residents may choose housing initiatives, accept commuting patterns, allow growth, or preserve existing development patterns. Other communities may choose to welcome growth. These options do not establish a forecast that alternative supply will appear at a particular place, price, or time.

The Hailey and Sun Valley example illustrated this preference: valued community character coexisted with severe housing pressures, long commutes from surrounding towns, locally pursued solutions, and opposition to unwanted projects. The discussion did not verify current median prices or establish findings about a named project or official. The point is who decides the response, rather than a promise of universal affordability.

Collective development control can limit an owner's proposed use of private property. That tradeoff is acknowledged alongside the security-of-ownership principle. Constitutional rights, due process, existing lawful obligations, and the distinction between development controls and unlawful discrimination remain part of the governing framework. Their precise relationship to resident voting requires legal design.

Working proposal: Residents approve general development rules. Major projects or departures from those rules receive a defined petition period before final approval; a qualifying petition triggers a binding resident vote. Particularly consequential proposals could require an automatic vote. Resident initiatives could also change the general rules or bring an affirmative proposal to decision. This is a starting mechanism, not a finalized referendum system or a requirement to vote on every routine permit.

Working safeguards: Publish understandable project information, relevant agreements, beneficial ownership, lobbying and campaign spending, and officials' conflicts. Provide accessible participation and review independent of implicated officials. Proposed participation includes renters as well as homeowners; property ownership would not purchase extra votes. Geographic representation, resident eligibility, and ballot procedures remain to be decided.

Open decisions: Define the electorate, project scope, petition threshold, majority and turnout rules, automatic-vote triggers, information requirements, decision deadlines, appeals, vested or existing approvals, and treatment of materially revised or repeat applications. Determine whether the whole municipality or a smaller affected area votes, who proposes general rules, and when an affirmative vote authorizes a project. Avoid assuming that a small organized group represents the community majority.

Open decisions: Reconcile development control with the earlier protections for native landscapes, gardens, and regenerative practices in Section 8, and determine which individual property uses are protected from collective veto. Do not silently repeal those existing commitments or treat all private activity as subject to a development ballot.

The earlier ownership-cap and divestment proposals remain separate. Releasing existing portfolios and creating additional dwellings are different mechanisms. Their effects, the approximate 20-unit suggestion, and the roughly 50% price-reduction ambition still require evaluation; the ambition is not a guarantee for every city or an authority to force unwanted local development.

Distribution and executive compensation

Two later questions explored the scale of economic distribution: what an equal distribution of \$100 billion would mean per citizen, and how CEO compensation compares with the lowest-paid employee.

These questions do not establish an adopted cash-payment policy, universal basic income, or executive-pay ceiling. A maximum executive-to-lowest-worker compensation ratio was raised as a possible design, with 50, 100, and 200 times discussed as examples; no ratio was selected.

If developed, the pay proposal needs definitions of compensation, equity, contractors, part-time and international workers, and the treatment of subsidiaries. CEO-to-median-worker disclosures should not be presented as measurements of CEO-to-lowest-worker pay. Historical numerical examples require fresh verification before public use.

Consequence based accountability and a public tracker

Selected direction: Assess businesses by the actual systemic consequences of their operations, including ecosystem damage, health risks, healthcare and housing costs, worker compensation, and restrictions on people's choices. Accountability should extend beyond conduct that has produced a criminal conviction. The public may demand changes when a business imposes preventable harm, even if existing law permits the practice.

Selected direction: Develop a public accountability tracker that identifies executives, controlling owners, and public officials responsible for consequential decisions. Its purpose is to make responsibility visible and support informed public demands for change. The selected concept does not establish criminal guilt, case-specific culpability, or an identical penalty merely from a person's title, wealth, affiliation, or association with an organization.

Selected direction: Responsibility is layered across a business hierarchy. Executives are responsible for their own decisions and for overseeing the people who carry out the business's work, including hiring people of integrity, training them, and maintaining operating standards. A manager remains responsible for their own harmful conduct or concealment. That direct responsibility does not erase leadership's indirect responsibility for supervision and the system in which the conduct occurred.

Selected direction: Consequences should reflect each person's authority, knowledge, actions, and failures of oversight. Indirect responsibility does not mean that an executive receives the same consequence as the person who committed or knowingly concealed a harmful act. Genuinely not knowing about an incident is different from knowing about it and intentionally dismissing it. Lack of knowledge does not automatically absolve leadership of its broader oversight responsibility.

Selected direction: Visible warning signs create a duty to investigate and respond. A leader who observes evidence that something is wrong is more responsible if they ignore it or fail to ask what is happening. Knowing that a problem exists does not require already knowing its full cause or who caused it; incomplete knowledge of the cause is not an excuse to disregard the warning. The assessment must distinguish genuine lack of knowledge, failure to pursue visible warnings, and knowingly dismissing harm.

Open decisions: Define reasonable oversight, the knowledge and evidence standards, the burden of proof, due-process protections, the allocation of responsibility among levels, and proportionate penalties or corrective remedies. Determine which consequences require legislation, administrative authority, or court proceedings. These principles do not establish automatic criminal guilt or an identical job-title-based penalty for every act within an organization.

Working record structure: Identify the person, organization, role and relevant tenure; the specific decision or practice; affected people and ecosystems; observed consequences and unresolved risks; the sources connecting the person to the decision; the evidence status; the person's or organization's response; the change sought; and progress toward repair. Distinguish responsibility for an original decision from a current leader's authority to address inherited problems.

Working assessment: Examine the strength of causal evidence, practical alternatives, leadership's knowledge and choices, benefits received, and costs imposed on others. Separate demonstrated effects, credible risks, allegations, forecasts, and unresolved hypotheses. Court findings, admissions, settlements, regulatory conclusions, and research results carry different meanings and should be labeled accordingly. A fine, settlement, or public commitment does not by itself demonstrate that harm has stopped.

Working safeguards: Use transparent sources, independent review, a fair opportunity to respond, correction procedures, and dated revision history. Include relevant contrary evidence and meaningful remedial action.

Limit records to information relevant to public responsibility; exclude private addresses, family targeting, threats, harassment, and unrelated personal information.

Open decisions: Define inclusion and evidence thresholds, review responsibility, funding, conflict controls, correction and challenge procedures, update frequency, and the conditions for publication. Determine which remedies require legislation, administrative authority, or court proceedings. Named examples require verification before they can be treated as findings about people or corporations.

The tracker's initial agricultural research record does not replace the separately selected glyphosate-ban endpoint in Section 8. Its proposed demands and progress measures remain subject to that policy direction, evidence review, and the unresolved implementation questions.

13 Legislative clarity and review of existing laws

Review and repeal of harmful laws

Proposed direction: Establish a continuing process to repeal or rewrite laws that enable corruption, impose unjustified control, obstruct human flourishing, or conflict with the adopted allocation of powers. Distinguish unnecessary interference from oversight that detects corruption and protects rights. The review standard must be published and contestable; an administration cannot repeal any law merely by labeling it bad.

Working process: Build a public inventory of laws and regulations, responsible jurisdictions, purposes, beneficiaries, costs, restrictions, and evidence of results. Accept public nominations with a reasoned response. Prioritize obsolete provisions, special-interest privileges, disproportionate licensing barriers, unjustified household self-sufficiency restrictions, and incompatible grants of authority. Evaluate rights, necessity, proportionality, competition, wellbeing, environmental effects, distribution of costs, and less restrictive alternatives. No single flourishing score determines legal validity.

A review body with disclosed conflicts and accessible hearings would publish keep, revise, or repeal recommendations. The legislature with jurisdiction votes on statutory changes; agencies use lawful procedures for rules; courts decide constitutional challenges in appropriate cases. Federal reviewers cannot erase state or local laws outside valid federal authority. Use manageable subject-specific repeal bills and publish the legal effects. A proposed five-year review cycle does not automatically expire every law. Use sunsets selectively for emergency powers, subsidies, and experimental regulatory programs, while preserving continuity for rights, contracts, courts, and essential services.

Corporate lobbying and political transfers

Selected direction: Make removing concentrated money from politics the first website topic. End corporate lobbying and corporate donations or other transfers of money to politicians, including indirect routes that defeat the rule. The principle that corporations are not people concerns political influence and funding here; it does not itself repeal every corporate legal right. The October 14 clarification retains this protection against purchased control while requiring government authority to be bounded and justified; it does not adopt equalization of all independent influence as a governing aim.

Politician investments while holding office

Selected direction: Ban politicians from making stock-market or real-estate investments while holding office. Define covered officials and transactions, treatment of preexisting holdings, divestment, and beneficial interests. Index funds, retirement accounts, and family homes have no adopted exemption.

Individual campaign donation limit

Selected direction: Cap individual campaign donations at \$10,000 per person. The donation cap's period, per-candidate or aggregate scope, covered contributions, and enforcement remain open. The \$10,000 figure is a campaign-policy choice, distinct from Section 6's illustrative tax contribution.

Independent spending and political organizing

Selected objective: End the unlimited-funding Super PAC model while protecting citizens' rights to organize and create or share political content supporting candidates. The paid-spending boundary remains unresolved. The later clarification does not establish a blanket ban on every PAC or citizen organization. The direction against politicians publicly supporting, endorsing, or affiliating with PACs requires precise definitions, scope, and protection of ordinary speech and association.

Unresolved advertising and outside-spending design: An initial candidate-only advertising proposal would require election ads to be created and submitted by candidates and their campaigns, with both production and distribution paid through the regulated campaign budget. Personal wealth must not provide a route around the intended campaign limits, but the exact self-funding restriction remains to be designed. Later discussion considered capped independent PAC spending. Those alternatives have not been reconciled. Define paid advertising, unpaid content, coordination, the press, and genuinely independent organizing before selecting the final boundary. The October 14 clarification selects no new broad independent-advocacy cap, matching-fund system or voucher system. It preserves the earlier alternatives as unresolved rather than silently adopting or erasing them.

Selected objective: Give a middle-class candidate and a billionaire a fair opportunity to communicate their ideas, and encourage policy-focused advertising rather than personal attacks or smear campaigns. This is an access and civic-culture objective, not an adopted censorship rule or a guarantee of equal electoral outcomes. Incentives and any enforceable advertising standards remain open.

Unresolved problem: A per-PAC budget cap comparable to candidate budgets is an option, not an adopted solution. A wealthy donor could split funding among many organizations. Affiliation and aggregation, donor splitting, pass-through funding, direct individual spending, disclosure, and enforceable limits remain to be designed. A cap on each group alone does not enforce the candidate's overall budget. Preserve grassroots participation while addressing circumvention.

Research correction: Citizens United v. FEC was a 2010 Supreme Court decision about independent political spending by corporations and unions. It did not create corporate legal personhood or grant corporations every right of individuals. The ruling left the prohibition on direct corporate contributions to federal candidates intact and upheld disclosure and disclaimer requirements. SpeechNow.org v. FEC separately removed limits on individual contributions to independent-expenditure-only committees. Sources S8 and S9.

Implementation direction: Address the holdings in Citizens United and SpeechNow that prevent the intended campaign-finance limits, through a constitutional amendment or changed judicial precedent where necessary. The project is willing to pursue constitutional amendments; an ordinary repeal bill does not itself overturn those decisions. No exact amendment or blanket removal of speech, association, or press protections has been adopted.

Working implementation: Develop disclosure, anti-coordination rules, sham-entity safeguards, review and enforcement, and voluntary small-donor support. Funding must preserve taxpayer consent. Scope for unions and nonprofits, donor privacy, ordinary advocacy, association, press protections, and enforcement remain open. Unlimited funding and undisclosed funding are distinct issues; the model should not presume that

every political contribution is secret. The earlier exploration of voluntary small-donor support is not approval of a matching-fund or voucher mechanism.

Short and understandable legislation

Selected direction: Limit the length of House and Senate bills and prevent provisions from being concealed in unreadable packages. A bill proposes creating, changing, repealing, or funding law; ordinarily the same text must pass both chambers and be presented to the President. Necessary definitions, eligibility rules, safeguards, appropriations, and amendments to existing statutes can require detail. Combining many measures into an omnibus increases length and bargaining pressure. Length can facilitate concealment but does not establish corrupt intent in every long bill. The claimed 40,000-page example has not been verified.

Working limit: Ordinary introduced bills and every amended version eligible for a vote may contain at most 50 standardized pages and 15,000 operative words, whichever limit is reached first. Prescribe readable type, margins, spacing, and treatment of tables. These are proposed starting thresholds for testing against real legislation, not research-proven optimal limits. Require one coherent subject and germane amendments. A broad title such as prosperity or national security does not establish a single subject.

Count binding schedules, appendices, and newly incorporated obligations toward the limit. Require all incorporated material to be publicly available and version-specific. Existing legal cross-references may remain, but changes must be shown in a complete readable comparison and explained. Nonbinding analyses and reproductions of unchanged law may accompany the bill outside the limit; they cannot acquire hidden legal effect. An agency cannot receive unlimited policymaking discretion merely to shorten a bill.

Working reading package: Publish a two-page plain-language explanation, section-by-section account, comparison against existing law, costs and funding, affected groups, constitutional authority, exceptions, new enforcement powers, and delegated rulemaking. Publish a searchable final text and version history at least seven calendar days before final passage. Material amendments, substitute text, and conference compromises restart review. Show public attribution for changes and registered lobbying submissions. AI can identify changes and inconsistencies, with cited text and human review; it cannot certify a bill as safe or replace members' judgment.

Complex measures: Divide appropriations and large code revisions into coherent, separately debated and separately voted bills, with explicit dependencies and coordinated effective dates. For indivisible technical revisions, propose a public two-thirds vote in each chamber on a specified length waiver, at least 30 days of review, and an explanation of why division fails. No unrelated provisions may use the waiver. A narrowly defined immediate emergency may justify a separate public waiver of the waiting period and a temporary measure expiring after 60 days unless reenacted under ordinary review. These numerical exceptions remain proposals.

Enforcement and feasibility: Begin with chamber rules, a public compliance assessment by professional legislative staff, and an opportunity to raise a procedural objection before a vote. Give rulings reasons and a recorded appeal. Existing House availability rules include a 72-hour framework with exceptions and waiver mechanisms; the proposal substantially strengthens review. Chamber rules and ordinary statutes cannot reliably bind future Congresses permanently. Constitutional entrenchment, including the waiver procedure and any judicial remedy, would be required for durable limits that a future majority cannot simply discard. Sources S3 and S10.

14 Decisions to resolve next

1. Precise powers and rights. Implement the October 10 local and federal assignments and the clarified local lifestyle-policy default in Section 3. Preserve protected individual freedoms, including marriage, and the territorial travel principle. Resolve exact jurisdiction, cross-boundary harm and national-function overlaps, healthcare administration, business and labor regulation, the remaining federal inventory, and practical rights-enforcement remedies.
 2. **Complete rural coverage.** Map cities, villages, suitable townships, and new rural districts; resolve overlapping jurisdictions, county roles, contested boundaries, and default arrangements so every resident has accountable local representation.
 3. **Binding resident development decisions.** Define project scope, electorate, petition and voting rules, affirmative initiatives, deadlines, disclosures, appeals, existing approvals, and the relationship between collective decisions and individual property rights.
 4. **Formation and merger thresholds.** Set separate procedures for coverage, charters, voluntary mergers, and later separation. Reconcile the earlier 75% approval, proposed 60% turnout, and unresolved 60% combined statement with community choice over its own merger membership.
 5. **Regional and cross-state arrangements.** Distinguish shared services from common laws and merged governments. Define legal authorization, resident representation, state membership, courts, funding, withdrawal, and conflict resolution for a region such as Cincinnati.
 6. **Continuity and transfer.** Inventory inherited laws and successor institutions; allocate assets, liabilities, staff, pensions, contracts, records, and enforcement. Decide the constitutional route, schedule, default charters, and simultaneous versus staged transfer.
 7. Accountability and qualification. Implement the selected three-stage agency process: public correction, outside financial supervision and disciplinary proceedings after failed correction, then mandatory restructuring or dissolution with service transfer and lawful removal of responsible leaders. Define qualifying failures, evidence, clocks, deciding authority, appeals, recovery/reset criteria, and legal implementation. Preserve institutional strike history while distinguishing incoming leaders' correction duties from predecessor guilt. Apply the October 14 scope to material financial failures and serious or repeated legal violations attributable to the agency, with causation established before strikes. Develop paired responsibility-and-funding approval, cost evidence, decision records, ongoing commitment tracking and shortfall procedures using existing oversight rather than a universal new budget-approval layer.
- Emergency reserve design. Develop the proposed 20% operating-budget reserve and the selected direction for 50% of its unused year-end balance to be paid in equal dollar shares to all federal employees within the agency, with the rest carried forward. Preserve the emergency-first purpose, the rejection of a verified-savings substitute, the adopted federal-budget emergency definition, nonretaliation and outside-chain reporting. Resolve the base, access, eligibility details, timing, caps, funding, oversight and legal authority; evaluate incentive risks and replenishment costs.
8. Cross-boundary harms and legal variation. Implement the selected rule against home-jurisdiction punishment of conduct lawful and carried out entirely elsewhere merely because of residence. Define its remaining scope questions, evidence, causation, appropriate shared-service costs, remedies, and appeals without equating travel, commuting, unequal wealth, or ordinary policy disagreement with wrongful harm. Design notice, record portability, and recognition rules. No workforce-residency quota or automatic police-escalation model has been adopted.

9. Consent and shared obligations. Reconcile complete individual tax direction with debt, pensions, contracts, common infrastructure, emergency services, and the earlier shared-obligations-first rule. No mandatory baseline or emergency override is settled.

10. Tax implementation replacement and attribution. Implement the selected \$500,000 annual federal allowance, ordinary brackets on the excess, six-step age taper, and dividend and capital-gains direction. Resolve birthday years, eligibility, deductions and credits, joint returns, business and investment boundaries, inflation indexing, timing, and revenue effects. State application remains provisional; Social Security and Medicare are deferred. Develop the consumption-led model, rural revenue options, indirect-tax attribution, corporate revenue, nonresponse, unused balances, and declining harmful-product receipts while preserving property-tax elimination.

11. Cincinnati spending review. Reconcile actual city, school, county, and relevant service spending with outcomes. Map each function to the proposed local and shared arrangements before selecting replacement revenue targets; separate accounting findings from verified waste or fraud.

12. Housing ownership and affordability. Define beneficial ownership, the cap, divestment, apartments, tenants, financing, construction, and transition. Evaluate meaningful affordability improvements without treating uniform local affordability or forced development as requirements.

13. Representation and elections. Finalize term and lifetime limits, leadership limits, electoral methods, candidate endorsement and donor thresholds, the campaign grant and debate sequence, funding and spending ceilings, ballot access, the official candidate portal, and independently verifiable digital participation. Preserve the selected criteria without converting examples into fixed numbers. Reconsider state representation and Federal Commonwealth eligibility under the existing framework. Examine winner determination, the Electoral College, electoral district boundaries, and prevention of gerrymandering as explicit open questions, without treating an option as an adopted solution.

14. Environmental commitments. Resolve pesticide scope and transition, seed rights, competition remedies, ecological measures, funding, and the relationship between resident development control and protected regenerative practices. Preserve the previously selected environmental objectives.

15. Poverty and opportunity. Define practical routes to work and improvement, reasonable contribution expectations, and treatment of people with constrained ability to work. Distinguish voluntary help, agreed obligations, emergencies, and rights protection without adopting compulsory wealth equalization or unapproved sanctions.

16. Administrative capacity and quality of life. Cost small-community responsibilities, test shared delivery, and define measures of resident influence, service reliability, fiscal integrity, and household wellbeing. Avoid treating either merger savings or uniform outcomes as established.

17. AI and public capabilities. Decide which proposed institutions, safeguards, and funding arrangements to adopt, including support for small local governments without restoring outside policy control.

Further implementation decisions: Apply the selected federal national-median earnings baseline with represented-state price adjustment and state/local earnings baselines; resolve worker populations, calculations, work expenses, and safeguards. Develop the corporate-money, lobbying, investment, and \$10,000 individual-donation directions. Resolve the independent-organizing and paid-advertising conflict, PAC circumvention, and legal route. The household-resource safeguards, law-review process, proposed bill-length limits, review periods, and exceptions remain open. Define the pharmaceutical-advertising ban's scope separately.

Public accountability tracker. Define evidence and inclusion standards, responsibility attribution, independent review, responses and corrections, remedies, and publication approval. Preserve the selected consequence-based approach without making criminal conviction a prerequisite or treating unverified allegations as findings. Apply the selected layered-responsibility and warning-sign principles. Reasonable oversight, knowledge standards, burdens of proof, due process, exact penalties, and the necessary legislation or other enforcement authority remain unresolved.

Healthcare implementation. Develop the Section 7 foundation into a costed, testable plan. Resolve ownership and administration, eligibility and covered care, need adjustment, readiness, catastrophic risk, independent outcomes and harm review, patient choice and appeals, price constraints, clinician pay, savings allocation, prevention investment, and funding compatible with taxpayer consent. Keep the broader healthcare development agenda separate from adopted payment principles.

Implementation method: Develop the existing guide into an explicit implementation plan. For each selected direction, identify the required changes, responsible institutions, costs and funding, legal route, practical tests, and transition steps. Keep proposed mechanisms and unresolved choices visibly separate from adopted policy. Define federal tasks before completing detailed allocation mechanics. A possible shift toward more local collection and less federal collection remains unselected; no debt cancellation or contribution-based healthcare entitlement has been adopted.

15 Decision history and sources

August 6, 2026: The discussion developed term limits, presidential-cycle Senate elections, district autonomy, limited state and federal powers, no-bailout rules, federal protection, statewide transfer of district powers, state stewardship, and AI proposals.

August 20, 2026: The environmental discussion established ecosystem enhancement, regenerative agriculture, seed sovereignty and farmer independence, agricultural accountability, a glyphosate and related-pesticide ban, native residential habitat incentives, and protection from restrictive HOA rules. It also developed implementation proposals that remain open in Section 8.

September 8, 2026: Discussion explored equal cash distribution and CEO-to-worker compensation comparisons without selecting new policies.

September 16, 2026: The project selected personal direction of tax contributions, framed as conscience and consent; rejected equal-vote allocation as a substitute; and requested a consolidated working document. The working document was then revised to integrate the environmental discussion and identify its jurisdictional and funding questions.

September 18, 2026: The property-tax and public-accountability discussion selected recurring property-tax elimination as the direction, favored consumption-based revenue, explored local taxpayer choice and voluntary or investment funding, and required government to qualify for fiscal authority. The project clarified that failure removes the incumbent's control of funds and transfers administration pending demonstrated competence or electoral replacement. Outsourcing is conditional on efficiency. The discussion also selected limits on institutional residential ownership and divestment, with about 20 units and a roughly 50% price reduction raised as an initial cap and ambition rather than validated parameters. Poverty reduction and personal contribution were emphasized. City-versus-district powers were unresolved at that stage. Cincinnati, Ohio, was selected for the initial spending case study.

September 18, 2026 further governance discussion: The project reconsidered districts after identifying both the need for culturally distinct communities to govern differently and the need for cross-state metropolitan

cooperation. A voluntary application and merger model was explored. The later selected framework gives protected local powers directly to existing cities, villages, and suitable towns or townships, with new rural municipalities or districts where needed. Every resident must have a successor local government before state authority is transferred. This supersedes the mandatory district layer and the rule that every territory must be called a district; it preserves complete coverage, optional cooperation, and voluntary consolidation.

The discussion also selected binding resident authority to approve or reject consequential development, local choice over growth and community character, and no general obligation to provide universally affordable housing or equalize neighboring communities' wealth. Nearby relocation and greater policy variation are accepted features and tradeoffs. Taxation can be acceptable when accountable and competent, and all government levels must qualify to administer funds. Workforce-residency quotas, exact resident-vote procedures, approval thresholds, cross-boundary remedies, and constitutional implementation remain unresolved. The earlier housing ownership limits and environmental commitments remain in force as project directions; their practical and legal relationships to the new framework require further work.

September 18, 2026 federal income-tax decision: The project adopted a \$500,000 annual allowance per person for combined eligible employment, self-employment, and personal business-profit income before age 30. Income above the allowance enters the ordinary brackets from the bottom: a 24-year-old earning \$600,000 is taxed as if earning \$100,000. Six equal annual steps restore the otherwise eliminated tax beginning at 30, reaching ordinary taxation at 35. The annual allowance is not a lifetime cap; the taper reduces tax savings rather than the allowance amount. The project also selected elimination of taxes on dividends and capital gains at every age. State application is a preference pending further design. Social Security, Medicare, employer contributions, and self-employment payroll taxes are deferred. Section 6 records implementation and funding questions.

September 25, 2026: The project requested congressional salaries reflecting ordinary middle-class earnings, historical examination of limited federal powers, a mechanism to remove harmful laws, protection for private-land resource use, review of Citizens United, and shorter legislation. Median-linked pay and bill-length limits are selected directions; definitions, thresholds, exceptions, and legal mechanisms are working proposals. The resource-use discussion expressly raises a conflict with shared-resource protection and resident development authority; this update preserves that open decision. Sections 3, 8, 11, and 13 contain the additions.

September 30, 2026 preservation update: The framework expressly supported assessing the systemic consequences of business operations without requiring a criminal conviction and developing a public tracker identifying responsible decision-makers. The discussion considered environmental damage, health, healthcare and housing costs, wages, and corporate and political choices. Detailed record fields and review safeguards remain working proposals. Named examples require evidence-sensitive treatment and verification before public use. This clarification broadens the accountability framework while preserving the earlier environmental commitments.

Earlier district-formation thresholds are not settled rules for the revised local-government model. Existing selected directions remain in force; numerical mechanisms and unresolved design choices retain their stated status.

October 2, 2026 accountability clarification: The project selected layered responsibility across a business hierarchy. Executives remain responsible for their direct decisions and indirect oversight, hiring, training, and standards; managers remain responsible for their own conduct or concealment. Consequences differ according to authority, knowledge, actions, and failures of oversight. Genuine lack of knowledge differs from knowingly dismissing harm. Visible warning signs create a duty to investigate and respond, and ignoring them

increases responsibility even when the full cause is unknown. Exact penalties, reasonable-oversight standards, burdens of proof, due process, and implementation remain open. The illustrative recycling example was hypothetical and establishes no allegation about a workplace or person.

October 2, 2026 inquiry method: The project requested a broader review of government functions while expressly rejecting the assumption that everything needs to change. Preserve functioning arrangements, establish that a problem exists, and prioritize urgent and critical problems. Undeveloped subjects are questions for inquiry, not adopted reforms or findings of failure.

October 5, 2026 healthcare foundation: The project approved paying for readiness, funding necessary care, and rewarding independently verified health as the starting point for a healthcare plan. The selected framework includes sustainable total cost, resource efficiency and price constraints, need-adjusted care budgets, stable competitive clinician salaries, catastrophic-risk protection and review of necessary care beyond local budgets, durable outcome rewards, conditional sharing of verified net savings, and protections for access, choice, appeals, and honest reporting. Section 7 preserves the safeguards and open decisions. A related clarification identifies research and technological advancement as primary federal functions under devolution. Specific research institutions and programs remain open. Healthcare ownership, governmental allocation, funding rates, reward shares, and the illustrative numerical formula were not settled; the approach remains subject to costing, testing, and further development.

October 10, 2026 fiscal and implementation clarification: The project reaffirms personal allocation of each person's own tax dollars at every level, including dissenters in local majority-approved projects, and explicitly declines equal allocation points. Intercommunity help remains voluntary rather than forced redistribution based on wealth. Simple, unbiased education should explain evidence and consequences; informed allocation choices remain binding even when credible information indicates that some people will probably be left without lifesaving care. No compulsory baseline or harm-triggered override is adopted. Budget balance and financial workability take priority over assuming a general debt reset. The existing healthcare cost-control architecture remains selected, while actual savings and funding sufficiency require costing and testing. Healthcare placement, contribution-based care eligibility, and a fixed local/federal tax-collection split remain unselected. Work starts with broad funding categories and defined government tasks, then develops specific implementation steps with responsible institutions, costs, legal changes, tests, and transition. Preserve functioning institutions and prioritize demonstrated problems throughout.

October 10, 2026 powers clarification: The project explicitly adds individual voting and election of representatives at local, state, and federal levels. It confirms the local subjects listed in Section 3 and adds lifestyle laws as a category, initially discussing recreational substances, same-sex marriage, and abortion. The later clarification below removes marriage from discretionary local prohibitions and adopts the general rights boundary. It confirms the specified federal responsibilities, including close state coordination on commerce, research-linked interstate infrastructure and environmental work, federal-court handling of state-boundary disputes, and emergencies beyond regional capacity without selecting a final emergency agency. Healthcare administration, business and labor regulation, currency and monetary policy, county/district and cross-border structure, state-police specialization, and federal cross-border-crime criteria retain their stated open or tentative status. The project reaffirms own-dollar tax direction, including dissenters in local project votes, and voluntary intercommunity support. Broad funding categories are the starting design scope; detailed implementation follows the allocation of governmental responsibilities. Existing selected healthcare, environmental, fiscal, rights, and legislative commitments remain in force.

October 10, 2026 lifestyle and travel clarification: The project selects local delegation of lifestyle laws wherever possible, with no federal override merely because officials disagree with local policy. Constitutionally protected freedoms are individual rights respected by all levels, with federal protection

rather than necessarily exclusive federal administration. Same-sex marriage is removed from the discretionary local lifestyle category. The project also selects freedom to travel for conduct lawful and carried out entirely in another jurisdiction, without punishment by the home jurisdiction based merely on residence. Cross-boundary harms and overlaps with existing national responsibilities remain explicit design questions. These clarifications do not silently remove selected national functions, establish unchosen exceptions, or adopt the tentative state-police escalation model.

October 11–12, 2026 political integrity and participation: The project selected political-money reform, term limits, and own-tax allocation as the opening website topics; selected corporate-money and lobbying restrictions, politician-investment restrictions, and a \$10,000 individual campaign-donation cap with scope still open; and affirmed protection of citizen organizing while leaving PAC caps and outside advertising unresolved. It selected exclusive endorsements and unique verified donor support without a minimum donation amount, developed the grant/debate/common-ceiling working sequence, and requested an official candidate-information portal. Federal pay now uses national median worker earnings adjusted for the represented state's prices, with state and local earnings baselines for their officials. Digital and paperless participation is a goal requiring a secure design; blockchain and AI are not adopted solutions. Pharmaceutical-advertising restrictions require scope design. Sections 7, 11, 13, and 14 reconcile these choices and unresolved mechanisms.

October 12, 2026 reader-edition audit: The project requested separation of term limits from candidacy and an audit for other merged proposals and missing details. The reader edition now distinguishes political-money measures, candidate qualification and funding, electoral methods, tax reforms, pharmaceutical advertising, ecological and agricultural proposals, residential ownership and development votes, fiscal mechanisms, AI services, and new-law versus existing-law review. The favored four-year Senate direction and the unfinalized three-term/12-year Senate, 12-year House, combined lifetime, six-year leadership and partial-term options remain visible. This is a presentation and completeness correction, not adoption of those numerical options or new policy authority.

October 12, 2026 agency-accountability decision: The project adopted an escalating response to serious, independently verified financial failure: a public corrective order, outside financial supervision and disciplinary proceedings if correction fails, and mandatory restructuring or dissolution with necessary-service transfer and lawful removal of leaders found responsible after a third strike. Institutional strikes survive leadership changes and reorganization; incoming leaders inherit a binding duty to repair with authority and resources, not predecessor guilt. Criminal evidence receives immediate investigation, with due process. Exact thresholds, clocks, fiscal-year treatment, reset criteria, deciding authority, and legal implementation remain open. The discussion did not adopt a congressional deficit-triggered reelection ban or its illustrative numerical thresholds.

October 12, 2026 late-entry clarification and election inquiry: The project selects the same exclusive-endorsement and unique-verified-donor qualification criteria for every ballot candidate, including late entrants. This closes any implied lower-threshold late-entry route. Missing the initial deadline still means missing starting grants and initial debates under the working campaign sequence. Exact deadlines, practical access to exclusive endorsements, and implementation remain open; no absolute prohibition on qualifying late or endorsement-transfer rule is adopted. The project separately requests open inquiry into winner determination, the Electoral College, electoral district lines, and preventing gerrymandering, without selecting a solution.

October 14, 2026 bounded authority and protection against purchased control: The governing aim was clarified as bounded, justified public authority and protection against purchased control of public decisions. Equalizing all independent influence is not an adopted objective. Existing corporate-money, campaign-

donation, investment and anti-circumvention directions remain. Earlier candidate-only advertising and capped independent-spending options remain unresolved; no new broad independent-advocacy cap, matching-fund system or voucher system was selected.

October 14, 2026 agency failure and responsibility for funding choices: The agency accountability model was clarified to cover material financial failures and serious or repeated legal violations attributable to an individual agency. Minor corrected errors and the national deficit do not automatically qualify. Establish cause before assigning a strike: agencies own credible estimates and competent management, while budget decision-makers own their attributable funding choices; shared cause is possible. Approve responsibilities and funding together, using actual staffing, spending, prices and explicit assumptions. A budget reduction requires real savings or revised required work. Record cost evidence, approved funds, changes, warnings, named signoffs and legislative votes. Warnings do not confer immunity and signatures do not establish guilt. Existing audit and oversight remain the review route; no universal new independent budget-approval layer was selected.

October 14, 2026 track commitments and address shortfalls before overspending: The working budget controls now track obligations, current spending and expected remaining costs. Changes should be approved before excess commitments; a credible shortfall should be reported with options for funding, savings or revised requirements. Implementation of any temporary emergency exception to advance cost, funding or commitment approval remains unsettled; accounting and accountability still apply. The clarification preserves taxpayer consent, necessary services, evidence-based responsibility and due process.

October 14, 2026 proposed emergency reserve and equal employee shares: A reserve additional to operations was proposed at 20% of an agency's operating budget, with carryover and replenishment only of the missing amount. The chosen distribution direction within that proposal gives 50% of an unused year-end reserve in equal dollar shares to every federal employee within the agency and carries forward the other 50%. The project rejected replacing this with a verified-efficiency-savings formula: the intended payment celebrates emergency funds that happened not to be needed and is not a guaranteed annual bonus. Genuine emergency needs come first. Before payout, existing audit and oversight should check obligations, required work and deferred necessary spending. Explicit nonretaliation and a reporting route outside management are needed; audits alone do not protect reporters. Incentives to avoid reserve use, pad budgets or defer work, and the cost of replenishing payouts, remain acknowledged risks. With an operating budget of 100, reserve target 20 and unused balance 12, the payment is 6, carryover 6 and replenishment 14. Exact base, eligibility, timing, caps and legal implementation remain open.

October 14, 2026 a defined emergency rather than routine budget overruns: The project selected the emergency definition from 2 U.S.C. 900(c)(20)–(21): new budget authority and spending for prevention, mitigation or response to loss of life or property or a national-security threat, arising from a sudden, urgent, unforeseen and temporary situation. The statute is a federal budget-enforcement definition; it does not itself authorize the proposed reserve or employee payout. Translating the definition into reserve eligibility and emergency procedures remains design work, and routine overruns do not automatically qualify.

September 18 research context

These findings inform feasibility and do not themselves establish America OS policy. Existing municipal institutions and tax rules describe the starting world, not the final local-government design.

Cincinnati's fiscal year ending June 30, 2025 report recognizes \$101.452 million of property-tax revenue in government-wide accounts. Governmental-fund expenditures total \$1,054.668 million, including \$346.136 million for public safety, \$145.361 million of capital outlay, \$235.612 million for general government, \$77.073 million of debt principal, interest and issuance costs, and \$250.486 million for the remaining service

functions. These accounting categories do not isolate spending of property-tax dollars or establish how much spending was useful. Schools, county government, and separate enterprise operations require additional review.

The city received an unmodified financial-statement opinion. Its federal-program audit identified \$166,317 of questioned WIC costs due to inadequate tracking by grant period. That finding is a control and compliance problem, not a finding of theft or a complete estimate of waste. Source: City of Cincinnati 2025 Annual Comprehensive Financial Report, printed pages 12-13, 28, and 42, available through the city's financial-report index: <https://www.cincinnati-oh.gov/retirement/crs-financial-information/cincinnati-annual-comprehensive-financial-reports/>

Cincinnati's railway sale and infrastructure trust provide a relevant example of investment-supported public funding. The approximately \$1.6 billion proceeds came from an existing public asset; this does not demonstrate that every district can replace taxes with investment earnings. Source: <https://www.cincinnati-oh.gov/cityofcincinnati/display-objects/banners/cincy-on-track-critical-infrastructure-plan/>

GAO's March 24, 2026 study found that investors meeting its definition of at least 5,000 single-family homes across at least five metropolitan areas owned less than 1% of all single-family homes in Cincinnati. The six-area sample is not nationally representative and does not measure the proposed 20-unit cap or apartment ownership. Source: <https://www.gao.gov/products/gao-26-108675>

The Pentagon's fiscal 2025 department-wide audit produced its eighth consecutive disclaimer of opinion. Inadequate reliable evidence is an unacceptable accountability failure under the proposed America OS principle regardless of whether its cause is deficient records, incompetence, indifference, or fraud. An audit disclaimer does not establish that trillions in cash were stolen annually; causes and responsibility require investigation. Source: Congressional Research Service, Defense Primer FY2025 Department of Defense Audit Results, April 28, 2026: <https://www.everycrsreport.com/reports/IF12627.html>

Other references for continuation include the IRS home-sale exclusion and staking-reward guidance, NYC participatory budgeting, the Central Park Conservancy, and Sandy Springs' experience comparing public and contracted delivery. These are examples and existing-law context, not adopted funding mechanisms:

- Home-sale rules: <https://www.irs.gov/taxtopics/tc701>
- Staking rewards and control over received assets: <https://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-drop/rr-23-14.pdf>
- Resident participation in public budgeting: <https://www.nyc.gov/site/civicengagement/our-programs/what-is-participatory-budget.page>
- Nonprofit public-service delivery: <https://www.centralparknyc.org/about>
- Public and private delivery comparisons: <https://www.sandyspringsga.gov/public-private-partnership/>

Research context for local self government

Existing institutions show that rural representation can begin with more than one form of local government. The Census Bureau describes county, municipal, town or township, school, and special-district structures by state. Ohio townships already have elected officials and service responsibilities, but their current powers are largely statutory. These are starting institutions, not evidence that the proposed transfer has already occurred. Sources: <https://www.census.gov/library/publications/2024/econ/2022isd.html> and <https://www.ohiotownships.org/townships101>

The Ohio-Kentucky-Indiana Regional Council of Governments demonstrates existing cooperation around Cincinnati. Its regional planning role is narrower than a government exercising common lifestyle laws. Interstate agreements have constitutional requirements; they cannot be assumed to establish broad local

sovereignty or bypass state constitutions. Sources: <https://www.oki.org/about/about-oki/> and https://constitution.congress.gov/browse/essay/artI-S10-C3-3-1/ALDE_00013531/

Evidence on governmental restructuring does not guarantee savings or increased resident influence. Allers and Geertsema's Netherlands study found lower administrative spending but no significant aggregate spending or taxation effect and no evidence of improved services. A Denmark study found councillors perceived greater influence for council leaders and senior administrators following mergers. These findings identify risks to test rather than predictions for America OS. Sources: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/jors.12268> and <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/03003930.2010.494112>

OECD's decentralization handbook emphasizes clear assignments, sufficient capacity and resources, and cooperation. A HUD-sponsored study documents zoning barriers to multifamily supply. These findings inform implementation and affordability analysis; they do not establish a project commitment to mandatory local housing production or compulsory resource equalization. Sources: https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/making-decentralisation-work_g2g9faa7-en.html and https://www.huduser.gov/publications/pdf/zoning_multifmlydev.pdf

The Supreme Court's *United Building v. Camden* decision subjected a municipal residency preference for public-construction workers to constitutional scrutiny involving out-of-state workers. It does not decide the legality of every possible workforce policy. The workforce-residency idea remains unadopted. Source: <https://caselaw.findlaw.com/court/us-supreme-court/465/208.html>

September 25 research sources

S1. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Usual Weekly Earnings, second quarter 2026, released July 21, 2026, and technical note. Quarterly figures illustrate scale; they do not substitute for an annual benchmark. <https://www.bls.gov/news.release/wkyeng.nr0.htm> and <https://www.bls.gov/news.release/wkyeng.tn.htm>

S2. Constitution Annotated, Overview of the Twenty-Seventh Amendment. https://constitution.congress.gov/browse/essay/amdt27-1/ALDE_00013830/

S3. National Archives, Constitution transcription, especially Articles I and V. <https://www.archives.gov/founding-docs/constitution-transcript>

S4. Library of Congress, Federalist 45; National Archives, Constitution history. <https://guides.loc.gov/federalist-papers/text-41-50> and <https://www.archives.gov/founding-docs/more-perfect-union>

S5. National Archives, Amendments 11 through 27, particularly the Reconstruction amendments and Sixteenth Amendment. <https://www.archives.gov/founding-docs/amendments-11-27>

S6. Congressional Research Service, Federalism-Based Limitations on Congressional Power, January 31, 2023, archival copy. <https://www.everycrsreport.com/reports/R45323.html>

S7. Colorado Division of Water Resources, Rainwater, Storm Water and Graywater. <https://dwr.colorado.gov/services/water-administration/rainwater-storm-water-graywater>

S8. Federal Election Commission, *Citizens United v. FEC*. <https://www.fec.gov/legal-resources/court-cases/citizens-united-v-fec/>

S9. Federal Election Commission, *SpeechNow.org v. FEC*. <https://www.fec.gov/legal-resources/court-cases/speechnoworg-v-fec/>

S10. Congressional Research Service, Availability of Legislative Measures in the House of Representatives, March 14, 2025, archival copy. <https://www.everycrsreport.com/reports/RS22015.html>

Sources establish factual and legal context. Proposed numerical limits, review periods, institutional designs, and resource-use standards are policy recommendations requiring further drafting and testing.

Agency-accountability sources and current-law context

GAO explains that financial-statement audits examine whether statements are fairly presented and that auditors can disclaim an opinion when they lack sufficient evidence. Audit results must be investigated rather than treated as automatic proof of criminal conduct. Source: GAO, All About Agency Financial Statement Auditing. <https://www.gao.gov/blog/all-about-agency-financial-statement-auditing>

Federal agency restructuring and transfers must comply with the authority Congress has provided; agencies cannot disregard their governing statutes. America OS must establish the lawful powers needed to implement its selected consequences. Source: Congressional Research Service, Organizing Executive Branch Agencies: Structure and Delegations of Authority, May 2, 2025. https://www.congress.gov/crs_external_products/R/PDF/R48523/R48523.2.pdf

Existing federal law criminalizes specified knowing destruction, concealment, or falsification of records with the intent to obstruct certain federal matters. This illustrates why evidence of intentional concealment requires immediate investigation; it does not make every accounting failure criminal. Source: 18 U.S.C. 1519. <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/USCODE-2024-title18/html/USCODE-2024-title18-partI-chap73-sec1519.htm>

S11. Office of the Law Revision Counsel, 2 U.S.C. 900(c)(20)–(21), definitions of emergency and unanticipated in federal budget enforcement. The project selected this definitional basis on October 14, 2026. It does not itself establish agency reserve eligibility or authorize the proposed employee payment. <https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?edition=prelim&req=granuleid%3AUSC-prelim-title2-section900>

The payment framework is a selected project direction; its performance, funding sufficiency, and unresolved institutional design are not established empirical findings.

Further implementation priorities

Implementation priorities: Develop the October 14 agency-budget controls and proposed emergency reserve in Section 5, preserving decisions and open mechanics. Political-money reform targets purchased control through bounded, justified authority. Earlier outside-spending options remain open; no new broad advocacy cap, matching system or vouchers is selected. Continue candidate qualification and funding, public-pay calculations, the candidate portal and secure digital participation without fixing unchosen thresholds or technologies.

The latest federal tax direction is now selected. Next, resolve its filing and business-income rules, model household and revenue effects, and evaluate the proposed extension to state income taxes. Return separately to Social Security and Medicare. These tasks should preserve the annual allowance, age taper, and ordinary brackets on income above the allowance rather than reopening them by implication.

Develop the October 10 allocation of powers into a precise implementation schedule, beginning with federal tasks and boundaries. Preserve the confirmed local subjects, local lifestyle-policy default, protected individual freedoms, territorial travel principle, individual electoral participation, and individual tax direction. Resolve the remaining cross-boundary and national-function conflicts; determine healthcare and business/labor responsibilities; and evaluate county, rural-district, state-police, and cross-border arrangements. Then design the resident development-vote process and test complete urban and rural

coverage on a hypothetical county. Use Cincinnati to separate local responsibilities from cross-state shared services and continue the spending review. Revisit state representation, fiscal qualification, revenue replacement, and housing ownership limits against that allocation. Record mechanisms as proposals until their thresholds, funding, safeguards, and legal route are decided.

Develop the accountability tracker's evidence standards, correction process, and review responsibilities while preserving its consequence-based purpose. Named research records require review of claims, attribution, and publication scope before publication.

Develop the selected agency-accountability process in Section 5 into enforceable standards. Resolve qualifying serious failures, correction milestones, independent decisions and appeals, leadership responsibility, sustained-recovery reset rules, and the legal route for supervision, restructuring, service transfer, and removal. Preserve competent staff, whistleblowers, and necessary services; do not equate an incoming leader's inherited repair duty with personal guilt. Establish cause across agencies and budget decision-makers; pair work with credible funding and track commitments. Develop the reserve, equal-dollar distribution, emergency definition, reporting protections and replenishment costs without substituting a guaranteed bonus or verified-savings formula.

Continue developing the healthcare starting framework in Section 7, beginning with sustainable funding for readiness and necessary care, independent outcome verification, patient protections, and explicit allocation of responsibilities. Test feasibility and the broader healthcare concerns without treating provisional mechanisms or illustrative numbers as adopted policy.