CONSTITUTIONAL FIDELITY PROJECT

The Evidence-to-Adjudication Chain

When missing records prevent verification, adjudication, and financial reconciliation

THE CENTRAL QUESTION

Can the public trace a government claim from the underlying record, through verification and factual determination, into a competent forum, and finally through financial reconciliation - without having to reconstruct what the government itself was required to preserve?

Companion to: Pattern & Practice · Terminal Failure - Institutionalized Systemic Moral Hazard · Bond Credibility Chain

September 2, 2026

PUBLICATION STATUS

PUBLIC RESEARCH EXPLAINER / SOURCE-CONTROLLED ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

This paper organizes documented source records, project analytical models, and unresolved factual questions. It is not a judicial finding, legal opinion, audit opinion, or finding of criminal intent. Where the record supports an inference rather than a finding, the paper says so.

Executive Summary

The Constitutional Fidelity Project has reached a common problem across three different records: the financial truth cannot be tested if the source record cannot be obtained; the factual claim cannot be resolved if no forum reaches it; and the public debt cannot be reconciled if the transaction lineage is incomplete.

THE EVIDENCE-TO-ADJUDICATION CHAIN

RECORD → VERIFICATION → FACTUAL DETERMINATION → ADJUDICATION → FINANCIAL RECONCILIATION → REMEDY / CONTROLLED RESOLUTION

Three current CFP records illuminate different failure points:

- Governor Abbott / Bond Credibility: the State can test the public-finance claim by producing certified debt, tax-base, appraisal, guarantee, budget, and disclosure records and allowing the arithmetic to reconcile.
- Spencer v. Godley ISD: a public-information mandamus draft alleges concrete production contradictions, including records acknowledged or enumerated by the District but not fully delivered, and a much larger body of responsive material described to the Attorney General.
- Jones / Monroe County: the record now identifies a foundational valuation question - what land was actually private and usable, what valuation method was applied, and what was taxed - while the case has moved through multiple procedural and remedial gates.

The point is not that every missing document proves wrongdoing. The point is that a system cannot be independently verified when the evidence needed to test it is unavailable, inaccessible, withheld, destroyed, or never adjudicated. The evidentiary question becomes: why is the record unavailable, who had the duty to preserve or produce it, and what can still be reconstructed?

CFP DISCIPLINE

Missing records are not proof by themselves. A stronger inference requires documented possession or acknowledged existence, a duty to preserve or produce, notice, contradictory representations, premature destruction, alteration, concealment, or other evidence tied to state of mind. The legal conclusion remains for a competent tribunal.

The paper therefore does two things at once: it preserves the seriousness of missing-record evidence, and it refuses to convert uncertainty into a finding before the chain is completed.

 |

1. The Chain: six links that must remain intact

1 PRODUCE THE RECORD	The original source records must exist, remain accessible, and be producible.	**Spencer / public records**
2 VERIFY THE INPUTS	The records must be authenticated, reconciled across custodians, and tested for completeness.	**Pattern & Practice / Terminal Failure**
3 IDENTIFY THE FACTUAL QUESTION	The dispute must be reduced to a testable proposition rather than a narrative.	**Jones / valuation method**
4 ADJUDICATE THE QUESTION	A forum must have authority, evidence access, competence, and remedial power to decide the actual claim.	**Non-adjudication**
5 RECONCILE THE FINANCIAL CONSEQUENCES	Debt, tax base, interest, refundings, cash flows, and affordability must close mathematically.	**Abbott / Bond Credibility**
6 ACCEPT OR REJECT THE CLAIM FROM THE EVIDENCE	The result should survive reproduction by an independent reader using the same source record.	**Controlled resolution**

A failure at the first link propagates. If the record cannot be produced, verification becomes inference. If the factual proposition is not identified, adjudication can become procedural motion practice. If adjudication never reaches the proposition, the financial consequences remain unresolved. And if the debt cannot be reconciled, public claims of solvency or relief cannot be independently validated.

 |

2. Record retention: Bond Genealogy is not one retention period

The Texas records rules confirm the point raised by the CFP project: different record series have different minimum retention periods. The user-supplied 2024 Texas State Records Retention Schedule illustrates this generally, but Texas public school districts are local governments; the more directly applicable framework is Local Schedule SD used with Local Schedule GR and Local Schedule TX. [1][2]

Selected Texas local-government examples

Record series	Minimum retention shown by Local Schedule GR	Why it matters to Bond Genealogy
Bond administrative records: preliminary studies, proposals/prospectuses, authorizations, certifications, policy correspondence	PERMANENT	Core issuance lineage should survive beyond the life of individual working files.
Bond registers	PERMANENT	Provides a permanent anchor for the bond identity and registered history.
Bond certificates and redeemed coupons	1 year after payment	Not every bond-related artifact is permanent.
Exchange/conversion/replacement records	1 year if contained in bond register; otherwise PERMANENT	Reconstructability depends on where the information was captured.
Annual budgets and amendments	PERMANENT	Preserves the official budget demand and amendments.
Annual financial reports	PERMANENT	Provides durable high-level financial reporting, but not every underlying transaction.
Arbitrage-rebate calculation records for tax-exempt bond proceeds	Retirement of last obligation + 6 years	Some bond-proceeds records extend beyond final obligation.
Accounts payable for bond-funded projects	Fiscal year end of last bond payment + 5 years for school districts	Detailed project cash tracing can have a finite retention period even while core bond records are permanent.
General ledger where annual financial audit exists	Fiscal year end + 5 years	Detailed accounting lineage may lawfully expire unless another rule/hold extends it.

THE RECONSTRUCTION PROBLEM

A permanent bond register may prove that an obligation existed, but it may not by itself reconstruct every refunding step, project disbursement, transfer, adjustment, investment transaction, or valuation input. Bond Genealogy therefore requires both permanent anchor records and timely preservation of finite-life supporting records.

The Texas schedules also state that electronic records must remain available and accessible for the assigned retention period, along with any hardware or software needed to read them. [1][2] That matters directly to CAMA migrations, legacy accounting systems, archived email, and transaction databases: retaining a file that can no longer be read is not meaningful reconstructability.

 |

3. Destruction holds and the practical burden inversion

Texas local-government retention schedules state that a record may not be destroyed after a litigation, claim, negotiation, audit, public-information request, administrative review, or other action involving the record has begun; the hold continues until the action and resulting issues are resolved. [1][3] The Texas State Library separately describes public-information requests and litigation as destruction holds. [4]

IMPORTANT DISTINCTION

Lawful disposition after a valid retention period is not the same as premature destruction, destruction during a hold, alteration, or concealment. The evidentiary analysis must identify the record series, applicable schedule, trigger date, custodian, disposition authority, and whether a destruction hold existed.

The practical burden inversion

CFP should not say that the law formally changes the presumption of innocence or the legal burden of proof. The more precise problem is a functional inversion of verifiability: when the government or its vendor controls the only source records needed to test the government's own representation, a citizen may be forced to disprove the representation without access to the evidence necessary to do so.

Condition	What can responsibly be inferred
Record never created / not required	No concealment inference from absence alone.
Record lawfully disposed after retention expired	Reconstruction may be impaired, but lawful disposition is not misconduct.
Record inaccessible after software migration	Raises preservation/control questions; intent depends on evidence.
Record acknowledged or listed, but not produced	Supports a stronger nonproduction inference and requires explanation.
Custodian says "all produced" while its own list shows missing items	Creates an internally testable contradiction.
Record destroyed while a hold applies	Potential legal violation; facts and authority must be established.
Alteration, deletion, concealment, or scrubbed audit trail shown by evidence	May support a stronger inference of knowing conduct; legal intent remains adjudicative.

This ladder matters because intent is rarely proved by a slogan. It is inferred from circumstances: knowledge, custody, duty, notice, contradictory statements, repeated conduct, and the timing or manner of destruction or withholding.

4. Abbott / Bond Credibility: the financial-reconciliation door

The Governor Evidence Request prepared by CFP converts the property-tax-relief debate into an observable production test. It does not require the Governor to accept the model. It asks the State to obtain records from the entities that authorized, issued, guaranteed, serviced, disclosed, appraised, taxed, and repaid the debt.

Production category	Examples requested
Debt register	CUSIPs, original and current principal, voted-but-unissued debt, refundings, defeasances, maturities, coupons, capitalized interest, call features.
Debt service	Annual principal/interest schedules, sinking-fund balances, trustee/paying-agent records, historical payments, covenant/default notices.
Authorization and issuance	Election propositions, ballot materials, official statements, AG approval, BRB submissions, bond-counsel opinions, underwriting agreements.
Sources and uses	Proceeds, premiums/discounts, investment earnings, construction costs, change orders, draws, retainage, unspent proceeds, arbitrage/rebate.
Tax base and appraisal	Certified rolls, exemptions/caps, parcel/class changes, appeal reductions, CAMA/GIS exports, model specifications, ratio studies, override/audit logs.
Guarantee and market reliance	PSF/TEA/BRB guarantee records, ratings, due diligence, EMMA filings, continuing disclosures, material events, known credit support.
Budgets and cash flow	M&O/I&S budgets, tax-rate worksheets, levy calculations, collections, delinquencies, abatements, tax sale/foreclosure activity.
Contingent/off-balance obligations	Notes, leases, energy contracts, P3/development agreements, pension/OPEB, interlocal obligations, swaps/derivatives, claims.

THE TEST

Produce → Certify → Reconcile → Test. A complete response validates the chain; a partial response identifies the missing links; a refusal or nonresponse becomes a documented fact about evidence access. CFP need not predict the response in order for the test to work.

Bond Credibility classifies debt lineage by reconstructability: GREEN when key source records are present and the math closes; YELLOW when documents or reconciliation differences remain unexplained; RED when current debt cannot be reconciled to original authorization and transactions. The model's strength is falsifiability: if the bonds are sound, complete records should be capable of proving it.

5. Spencer / Godley ISD: the record-access door

The September 2 First Amended Petition is a draft pleading, not a judicial finding. Its significance is that several allegations are framed around the District's own records, transmittals, statements, and the Attorney General process rather than around generalized suspicion.

Documented allegation in the draft	Why it is testable
The District represented to the Attorney General that approximately 65,000 documents were responsive to a sixteen-request group and supplied a representative sample.	The representation and sample can be compared with the production history and later releases.
On two June 15 requests, a District transmittal enumerated 36 attachment files; the draft says 34 were delivered and identifies two missing file names.	The file list and delivered files can be counted directly.
After itemized deficiency notices, the public-information account responded: "All responsive documents have been provided."	The completeness statement can be tested against the District's own 36-file enumeration.
The District twice stated it had no responsive records to a financial-investigation request. The draft identifies a TEA compliance-review notice and an earlier complaint email in a District mailbox as facially responsive.	Existence, custody, date, request wording, and search methodology can be examined.
The Attorney General ruling required release of the non-marked representative information and did not authorize withholding other substantially different requested records; the draft alleges the District did not challenge the ruling.	The ruling, receipt date, challenge docket, and production can be compared.

WHY THIS MATTERS TO THE CHAIN

Spencer is not the Bond Credibility case. It illustrates the first link: if public records cannot be obtained, the citizen cannot independently reconstruct the financial or governance proposition that those records would test.

The draft also pleads that the District had no CFO through much of July and August and that the employee in charge of PIA requests resigned July 31. Staffing can explain delay, but it does not answer the separate questions of statutory production duties, preservation, search completeness, or whether identified records exist.

6. Jones / Monroe County: the adjudication door

The Florida record illustrates a different failure point. It contains evidence concerning changing parcel measurements, canal-bottom / submerged-land treatment, taxation consequences, permitting consequences, and reduced recognized private-land area. The July 31 appellate brief ties those subjects to taxable area, regulatory treatment, sovereign submerged-land determinations, practical usability, and taxation history. Yet the foundational valuation proposition remains unresolved through factual findings.

THE MISSING VALUATION QUESTION

What land was actually private upland? What part was submerged or otherwise restricted? What legally permissible and economically usable rights attached to each component? What valuation method was applied? What value, if any, was assigned to restricted area? What tax consequence followed?

CFP's updated Jones case study separates three categories:

- DOCUMENTED: changing governmental dimensions; canal-bottom / sovereign-submerged-land treatment; taxation and permitting consequences; Property Appraiser correspondence stating submerged land carried no measurable value in the appraisal system.
- TO BE OBTAINED / VERIFIED: historical appraisal worksheets, parcel sketches, land-component codes, certified values, waterfront adjustments, survey/GIS history, and any actually applicable federal or state development restrictions.
- QUESTION TO BE ADJUDICATED: whether historical valuations accurately reflected actual private-land area and legally permissible / economically usable utility, and whether any materially restricted component was nevertheless assigned value.

The appellate process has meanwhile addressed or implicated Chapter 162 review, circuit-court equity jurisdiction, declaratory relief, inverse condemnation, ripeness/exhaustion, pleading sufficiency, and appellate briefing requirements. The disciplined CFP conclusion is not that procedure proves improper motive. It is that the procedural result matters when the underlying factual valuation question remains unresolved.

THE READER QUESTION

If the taxpayer says, "Your dimensions are wrong; part of what you taxed is submerged, restricted, or non-buildable; show me the appraisal math," who actually adjudicates that underlying factual claim?

 |

7. CAMA migration, audit trails, and why deep audits become necessary

Pattern & Practice already identifies the record-access problem at the appraisal-system level. Volume II asks whether an owner can obtain model code, logs, audit trails, complete comparables, data dictionaries, override histories, and certification records. It also notes that ordinary ARB service does not establish expertise in CAMA architecture, database logs, permissions, overrides, spreadsheet reconciliation, or software audit trails.

Volume I reports that the 2026 JCAD review identified CAMA migration problems, weak documentation and standardization, spreadsheet/manual workarounds, governance and recordkeeping concerns, and inadequate controls over property discovery/data acquisition. It carefully notes that operational weakness alone does not prove fraud. The significance here is reconstructability: a system transition can impair the ability to answer who changed what, when, under which authority, and with what effect unless audit history is deliberately preserved.

SOFTWARE CHANGE ≠ DATA SCRUBBING

A CAMA replacement or migration is not proof of intentional scrubbing. But migration without preserved audit logs, user histories, override records, model versions, data dictionaries, and conversion maps can destroy the practical ability to reconstruct the valuation history. Whether that loss was lawful, negligent, reckless, or intentional is a separate evidentiary question.

The audit paradox

The need for a deep forensic audit can itself be downstream evidence of a failed ordinary control environment. A functioning system should not require subpoenas and reconstruction merely to determine what source records exist and how an official result was generated.

A useful comparative example appears in the Missouri Jackson County audit preserved in CFP. The State Auditor reported unsuccessful attempts and subpoenas for records, stated that some parties were unresponsive, and attributed increased audit cost and delay in part to the appraisal district and Board of Equalization withholding certain records. That does not prove a Texas scheme; it demonstrates how missing or withheld source records can turn ordinary oversight into an expensive forensic reconstruction.

8. The Infection Rate Spreadsheet: verification before conclusion

The Bond Credibility presentation converts the project's "infection" theory into a falsifiable budget-backsolve test. The model asks whether the required levy can be reached within defined market-value constraints, mass-appraisal standards, applicable USPAP requirements, and stated tolerances without systematic distortion.

PROJECT ANALYTICAL RESULT

The project states that, under the defined condition, the spreadsheet produces "no compliant CAD." CFP should present that as a reproducible analytical result - with inputs, tolerances, formulas, data dictionary, exceptions, and reproduction instructions available for challenge - rather than as an adjudicated finding about every appraisal district.

That distinction is important. The Infection Rate model can test whether a claimed revenue architecture is mathematically compatible with independent market-value constraints. It does not, by itself, establish individual intent, identify who changed a parcel, prove that a particular certified roll was falsified, or replace the need for source records. The spreadsheet and the Evidence-to-Adjudication Chain are therefore complements:

Analytical model can show	Source record must show
A defined set of inputs does or does not reconcile under the model.	What inputs were actually used by the district, CAD, issuer, or agency.
A revenue target requires valuation assumptions outside defined constraints.	Who selected/changed the assumptions, when, why, and under what authority.
Debt service exceeds modeled verified capacity under stated assumptions.	The complete debt lineage, rates, refundings, guarantees, cash flows, and tax-base data.
The project's systemic hypothesis replicates across the scored sample.	Whether each actor-specific claim is documented and legally attributable.

This is the same evidentiary discipline used in Terminal Failure: preserve → reconstruct → reconcile → adjudicate. The mathematical model becomes most powerful when the source data needed to falsify it are fully available.

9. The Evidence-to-Adjudication failure map

Link	Normal condition	Failure condition	Resulting risk
RECORD	Source record preserved, readable, mapped to custodian.	Missing, inaccessible, lawfully expired, withheld, destroyed, or migration history lost.	Verification begins with gaps.
VERIFICATION	Independent person can reproduce the official result.	Only summaries, certifications, ratings, or outputs remain.	Authority substitutes for reconstruction.
FACTUAL QUESTION	Claim is reduced to a precise proposition and necessary inputs.	Dispute remains broad, narrative, or procedurally fragmented.	Forums decide adjacent issues.
ADJUDICATION	Competent forum reaches evidence and can grant claim-specific relief.	Jurisdiction, exhaustion, pleading, preservation, or remedial limits prevent merits finding.	Underlying fact remains unresolved.
RECONCILIATION	Debt and tax-capacity math close across source systems.	Principal, interest, refundings, guarantees, valuation, and cash records cannot be traced together.	Solvency/relief claims remain unvalidated.
RESOLUTION	Result can be accepted or rejected from transparent evidence.	Missing record or non-adjudication is treated as proof for one side.	Practical burden inversion.

THE CONTROLLED RESPONSE

Do not fill a missing record with an assumption. Label the gap. Identify the custodian. Identify the retention rule. Determine whether a hold applied. Reconstruct from independent sources where possible. Then ask a competent forum to determine the disputed fact.

A statewide test can be simple

- If the bond chain is complete, produce the permanent anchor records and the surviving supporting records.
- If supporting records were lawfully destroyed, identify the record series, disposition date, authority, and surviving substitute records.
- If records are missing after software migration, produce migration specifications, audit logs, conversion maps, vendor custody records, backups, and disposition logs.
- If a public-information request or litigation hold applies, identify the preservation steps and custodians.
- If the financial claim is sound, backfill Bond Credibility and publish the reconciliation rather than a summary total.

 |

10. Conclusion: the record should carry the burden of verification

The Evidence-to-Adjudication Chain is not a new allegation. It is a method for preventing allegations from substituting for proof and preventing missing records from substituting for adjudication.

THE PUBLIC TEST

If the records exist, produce them. If the claim is wrong, adjudicate it. If the numbers reconcile, show the math.

The public should not have to perform a forensic reconstruction merely to discover what its government already knows, possesses, values, taxes, borrows, guarantees, and obligates the public to repay.

At the same time, CFP should not presume what a missing record proves. The source-controlled method is stronger: determine whether the record should exist, whether it was required to be retained, whether a preservation hold applied, whether it was acknowledged or listed, whether production was complete, and whether independent source systems can reconstruct the transaction. Only then move from missing record → inference → finding.

The three current records show why the chain matters. Spencer tests access to the record. Jones tests whether the underlying factual valuation question reaches adjudication. The Abbott/Bond Credibility request tests whether the State's public-finance claims survive complete source-record reconciliation. Pattern & Practice and the Infection Rate model provide the system-level verification framework.

FINAL CFP QUESTION

Who independently verified the material inputs before the public was obligated to pay - and can an independent reader still reproduce that verification today?

 |

Source Register and Evidence Status

Official Texas records-retention authorities

[1] Texas State Library and Archives Commission, Local Schedule GR, Retention Schedule for Records Common to All Local Governments. Mandatory minimum periods; electronic accessibility; destruction holds; bond and financial record series. https://www.tsl.texas.gov/slrm/localretention/schedule_gr

[2] Texas State Library and Archives Commission, Local Schedule SD, Retention Schedule for Records of Public School Districts. School districts use SD with GR and TX; electronic records must remain available and accessible for the assigned period. https://www.tsl.texas.gov/slrm/localretention/schedule_sd

[3] Texas Local Government Code Chapter 202, destruction and litigation/open-records restrictions for local government records. https://statutes.capitol.texas.gov/Docs/LG/pdf/LG.202.pdf

[4] Texas State Library and Archives Commission, “Texas, Hold ’Em! A Review of Destruction Holds,” describing Public Information Act and litigation holds. https://www.tsl.texas.gov/slrm/blog/2023/04/texas-hold-em-a-review-of-destruction-holds/

CFP and case-source records

[5] Governor Abbott Bond Credibility Evidence Request Deck, CFP, September 2026. Project evidence request; not a government production or adjudicated finding.

[6] Spencer v. Godley ISD, Plaintiff’s First Amended Petition for Writ of Mandamus under the Texas Public Information Act, draft dated September 2, 2026. Party pleading; allegations are not judicial findings.

[7] Florida - Jones / Monroe County: A Documented Fragmented-Remedy Sequence, CFP updated September 2, 2026; underlying July 31 Amended Initial Brief and September 2 response materials. Comparative procedural record; no merits finding by CFP.

[8] Pattern & Practice Volume I - Constitutional Crisis of Non-Adjudication; Pattern & Practice Volume II - Who Watches the Watcher? CFP comparative reports. Reports distinguish official sources, allegations, analysis, and adjudicated facts.

[9] Terminal Failure - Institutionalized Systemic Moral Hazard, CFP Storm Summit presentation. Analytical architecture: DATA → VALUATION → TAXATION → OVERSIGHT → ADJUDICATION; evidence discipline: preserve → reconstruct → reconcile → adjudicate.

[10] Bond Credibility Chain presentation and workbook materials. Project analytical model; “Infection” result should be reproduced from published inputs, formulas, assumptions, tolerances, and exceptions rather than treated as an adjudicated fact.

[11] Missouri Property Tax Audit preserved in the CFP comparative record. Official audit material describing subpoenas, access difficulties, and audit delays attributed in part to withholding of records; comparative evidence only, not proof of Texas conduct.

Evidence-status rule

DOCUMENTED = source record exists and supports the proposition stated. ANALYTICAL = mathematical or structural consequence generated by a disclosed model. DEVELOPING / ALLEGED = claim, lead, or inference awaiting primary evidence or adjudication. ADJUDICATED = a competent tribunal has actually determined the proposition. The categories should never be silently merged.

