PUBLIC RECORDS / WORKED EXAMPLE

Model Cities: award versus receipt

Ten decisions from the public record | Part 10

Prepared by Dossier Editorial | November 4, 2026

EVIDENCE SOURCES	EVIDENCE CHECKED	PUBLISHER INSTITUTIONS
2	2026-11-04	2

SECTIONS	READER QUESTIONS	REVIEW SCOPE
7	3	Public records

EVIDENCE CHECKED	2026-11-04
EDITION	1 | Public-source research
ARTICLE	dossierplus.ai/blog/model-cities-grant-announcement-versus-funds-received

IMPORTANT USE NOTE

Retrospective public-source walkthrough, first published November 4, 2026. Prepared with AI assistance. This is an educational worked example, not a client investigation, legal opinion, or record of a live Dossier research run. No human legal review is claimed.

Generated by Dossier · Doc ID DSR-JKHY-7UN4-8FHS · Seal E63CFF8534F8 · SHA-256 0A2EB44527454D7B · Issued 2026-11-04 17:41 UTC

PART 01

The decision in brief

No. Selection for a grant program and receipt of cash are different events. DOJ's October 30, 2026 Model Cities announcement names four jurisdictions sharing nearly $300 million and says plans will be finalized and implemented. The announcement alone does not establish each recipient's final award terms, drawdowns, spending, or results.

Publication date: November 4, 2026. Historical event dates are identified separately. This PDF and the article use the same structured source selection and findings.

PART 02

Executive summary

The Justice Department selected Jacksonville, East Baton Rouge Parish, Jackson, and St. Louis for the Model Cities Initiative. Its announcement describes nearly $300 million across the program and names the relevant jurisdictions or departments. It also says DOJ will work with them to finalize and implement public safety plans. **[S01]**

Jacksonville Sheriff's Office separately announced its selection and a share in the federal commitment. That supports the local agency's acknowledgment of selection, not receipt of the entire program total. The packet outcome is "selection supported; recipient-level terms, cash, expenditures, and attributable outcomes not established by these announcements." **[S02]**

PART 03

Start with the recipient and amount type

The question is how to evaluate a public-funding claim without inflating it. Identify the legal recipient, administering department, award identifier, period of performance, and type of amount. A city name and its police department may play different administrative roles; the executed award should resolve who receives and manages the funding.

This is a bounded review of the October 30 selection announcements as available on November 4. No award agreement, award database reconciliation, payment ledger, procurement file, or program evaluation was examined. The article does not conclude that those records do not exist or that money has not moved since selection.

PART 04

Keep selection and implementation separate

DATE	PUBLIC DEVELOPMENT	WHAT IT SUPPORTS
June 2026	Program launch described by DOJ	Background to the later selection. [S01]
October 30, 2026	DOJ identifies four selected jurisdictions	Selection and program-level announced funding. [S01]

Generated by Dossier · Doc ID DSR-JKHY-7UN4-8FHS · Seal E63CFF8534F8 · SHA-256 0A2EB44527454D7B · Issued 2026-11-04 17:41 UTC

DATE	PUBLIC DEVELOPMENT	WHAT IT SUPPORTS
October 30, 2026	Jacksonville publishes its own selection notice	Recipient-side acknowledgment, without a cash receipt. [S02]
Not established in this packet	Executed terms, draws, expenditures, and evaluated outcomes	Four distinct follow-up questions.

PART 05

What the announcement does and does not establish

Outcome: the collective funding statement is supported as an announcement. Do not assign the whole program total to each selected jurisdiction. Without a recipient-level allocation, dividing the total equally would also be an unsupported assumption. A useful amount register preserves “program total” as its own category.

Outcome: selection does not settle allowable spending or performance conditions. Obtain the award document, amendments, and accepted budget for those questions. A general list of intended priorities is not evidence that a particular local purchase was approved, contracted, delivered, or paid.

Outcome: program effectiveness remains unassessed. The announcement describes intended public-safety benefits. A later outcome claim needs a defined measure, baseline, period, implementation evidence, and a method that addresses other explanations. An earlier trend should not be presented as an effect of newly announced funding.

The two reviewed pages come from the federal announcer and one local recipient-side agency. They are useful perspectives on the same selection, not an independent audit of spending or results. Preserve that provenance distinction.

PART 06

The funding-to-outcome decision tree

1. IS THE EXACT RECIPIENT AND ITS AWARD IDENTIFIER ESTABLISHED?

- If established: Create a recipient-level record separate from the program total.
- If unresolved: Retain selection as the supported stage and request the award instrument.

2. DO MATCHED RECORDS SHOW OBLIGATION, DRAWDOWN, AND EXPENDITURE?

- If established: Record each event and amount with its own date and source.
- If unresolved: Keep those categories unresolved instead of treating an announced amount as cash.

Generated by Dossier · Doc ID DSR-JKHY-7UN4-8FHS · Seal E63CFF8534F8 · SHA-256 0A2EB44527454D7B · Issued 2026-11-04 17:41 UTC

3. DOES A MEASURED OUTCOME FOLLOW DOCUMENTED IMPLEMENTATION?

- If established: Assess the measure, baseline, comparison, and alternative explanations.
- If unresolved: Describe the benefit as an intended result or an unevaluated claim.

PART 07

Build a public-funding dossier

Create a program matter with separate questions or linked records for each recipient. Save the federal announcement and the local response. Add a source-linked row for the selection and a program-level amount row. Leave recipient allocations blank unless a reviewed record establishes them.

When award documents arrive, add the award number, legal recipient, approved budget, period, conditions, and amendment history. Keep obligation, receipt, spending, and performance evidence separate. Reconcile cumulative totals before adding amounts across dates or portals.

Before exporting, check that the executive summary uses verbs that match the record: selected, awarded, obligated, drawn, spent, or measured. This workflow is an educational example. No grant-account access, private client data, live Dossier matter, or agency outreach was used.

PART 08

The next useful evidence

Request the signed award and amendments, the recipient's accepted budget, matched drawdown and expenditure records, and the published performance framework. A follow-up installment should compare the October 30 selection record with actual recipient-level evidence. It should not fill missing figures with estimates merely to produce a complete-looking table.

PART 09

Questions readers ask

DID EACH CITY RECEIVE NEARLY $300 MILLION?

The DOJ announcement describes a collective program amount for four jurisdictions. It does not support assigning that total to each one. **[S01]**

DOES A LOCAL SELECTION ANNOUNCEMENT PROVE MONEY ARRIVED?

No. Jacksonville's notice confirms selection and describes a share in the commitment, not a verified transfer. **[S02]**

DOES SELECTION PROVE THE PROGRAM REDUCED CRIME?

No. Intended benefits and measured effects require different evidence, including implementation and a defensible evaluation.

Generated by Dossier · Doc ID DSR-JKHY-7UN4-8FHS · Seal E63CFF8534F8 · SHA-256 0A2EB44527454D7B · Issued 2026-11-04 17:41 UTC

PART 10

Linked source register

Titles with a recorded URL link to that source. Entries without a URL identify retained material but do not open an original file. For any court or business record being used in litigation, obtain a certified copy directly from the clerk or filing authority and preserve the retrieval date.

S01 **Justice Department announces Model Cities selections**
Funding selection announcement. Anchor: October 30, 2026; selected jurisdictions, named departments, and plan finalization paragraphs. The live release notes an update identifying specific departments. It is not an award agreement or payment ledger. · retrieved 2026-11-04

S02 **Jacksonville selected for the Model Cities Initiative**
Recipient-side announcement. Anchor: October 30, 2026; selection and share in federal commitment. Corroborates local acknowledgment, not the allocation, receipt, spending, or measured outcome. · retrieved 2026-11-04

Generated by Dossier · Doc ID DSR-JKHY-7UN4-8FHS · Seal E63CFF8534F8 · SHA-256 0A2EB44527454D7B · Issued 2026-11-04 17:41 UTC