

## Makayla Rodriguez

---

**From:** Wendi Hundley [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 26, 2024 1:30 PM  
**To:** CRCRC; DC Bench  
**Cc:** Ashley Wayman; Makayla Rodriguez  
**Subject:** \*NEW\* Clarification and Concern Regarding Agenda Item 6

Dear Chair Bench,

I hope this message finds you well. I am reaching out to seek clarification and promote transparency regarding the recent handling of my letter dated September 25, 2024, concerning Agenda Item 6. It appears that my letter was not included under the relevant agenda item but was instead placed under Agenda Item 5.

I would also like to offer some additional context, if you are open to it. The snippet of my correspondence with the city that you included does not reflect the entirety of my communication on this matter. I submitted two Public Information Requests (PIRs) related to this issue. The initial PIR was submitted on November 15, 2023. The city informed me that my request was under legal review and that they would need my permission to provide redacted information. I did not give permission for redacted information because my intent was to access the complete, unredacted dataset. My motivation for seeking the unredacted data was to understand what may have been changed, particularly after your comments at the November 13 CRCRC meeting and the November 14 City Council meeting regarding your intention to refine the raw survey data before distributing.

Despite this, on December 1, 2023, I received a dataset from the city that included redactions, which was not what I requested. I followed up to clarify that I was seeking the complete dataset without redactions, and this was treated as a new PIR.

The city categorized it as a new request because, according to Texas State Code, a governmental body must seek a ruling from the Texas Attorney General's Office Open Records Division before redacting most information from requested documents. The Attorney General's ruling to the city on March 5, 2024 (OR2024-007881), stated that the city was not permitted to redact information and must release the records in full.

There were 10 months and 10 days between my original PIR on November 15, 2023, and the inclusion of this issue under CRCRC Agenda Item 6 on September 26, 2024. This long delay naturally raises questions about the timing and intent behind including this item on the agenda after such a considerable gap. I did not anticipate being singled out for engaging in a lawful and protected civic activity. I discovered this agenda item only yesterday and wrote to the CRCRC to clarify my involvement and provide context. While I would like to address this matter in person tonight, my family and I will be attending my daughter's volleyball game.

I have a few questions I would appreciate your insight on:

1. **Inclusion of Correspondence in Agenda Item 6:** As Chair, would you consider including my letter dated September 25, 2024, along with this email under Agenda Item 6? Including them where they are most relevant would provide the public with a comprehensive view of my involvement and concerns in the appropriate context.
2. **Other Public Requests and Access to Data:** I have not made any public comments, oral or written, about the survey data. However, I have noticed that other individuals have publicly commented and provided their own analysis of the survey data. I am curious to know how these individuals obtained the dataset, as I did not provide it to them. Have there been any other Public Information Requests (PIRs) for this data? If so, shouldn't those requests also be included in the discussion?
3. **Selective Focus on My Request:** Could you help me understand why only my request was included under Agenda Item 6? Has there been any coordination with specific community members known for making public comments directed at me? I suppose we will find out at tonight's meeting?
4. **Open Letter from CRCRC:** I noticed that an open letter was presented as representing the entire CRCRC. Could you clarify how this letter was drafted without a properly published meeting? Did all members of the CRCRC have the opportunity to review and agree to the letter outside of a public meeting? If not, how was it included in the agenda?
5. **Compliance with Training Requirements:** Have you completed the required training on the Texas Open Meetings Act and the Texas Public Information Act, which all public officials are expected to undertake? If so, how do these laws guide your decisions regarding public information and open meetings?

I am concerned that this agenda item might be retaliation for my Public Information Request and politically motivated, potentially singling me out for simply exercising my rights. This could impact the transparency and trust we should all be fostering within our community. It's crucial that official channels are used fairly and not in a way that might discourage residents from participating or sharing their concerns. I sincerely hope this is not the case. I remain committed to working together with integrity and respect for our shared values. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

I would appreciate your response to these questions for the public record.

Sincerely,  
Wendi Hundley