



**ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS**  
**GREG ABBOTT**

March 30, 2006

Mr. Jesus Toscano, Jr.  
Administrative Assistant City Attorney  
Office of the City Attorney  
1500 Marilla, Room 7BN  
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2006-03190

Dear Mr. Toscano:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 245240.

The City of Dallas (the "city") received a request for "a copy of all e-mails, memos and other correspondence between the Commission on Productivity and Innovation [(the "commission")] and the city manager's office as well as members of the city council including [the] Mayor" along with "a copy of the [c]ommission's expenses in 2005 and all resumes, biographies or professional materials of the board members." You state that some of the requested information will be released to the requestor. Further, you state that the city has no information responsive to the portion of the request regarding expenses for the commission for 2005.<sup>1</sup> You claim that the remaining information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.111 and 552.137 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

---

<sup>1</sup>The Act does not require a governmental body to release information that did not exist when a request for information was received, create information responsive information, or obtain information that is not held by or on behalf of the city. See *Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266, 267-68 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dis'd); Open Records Decision No. 452 at 3 (1986).

Section 552.111 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure “an interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency.” Gov’t Code § 552.111. Section 552.111 encompasses the deliberative process privilege. *See* Open Records Decision No. 615 at 2 (1993). The purpose of this exception is to protect advice, opinion, and recommendation in the decisional process and to encourage open and frank discussion in the deliberative process. *See Austin v. City of San Antonio*, 630 S.W.2d 391, 394 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1982, no writ); Open Records Decision No. 538 at 1-2 (1990).

In Open Records Decision No. 615 (1993), this office re-examined the statutory predecessor to section 552.111 in light of the decision in *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ). We determined that section 552.111 excepts from disclosure only those internal communications that consist of advice, recommendations, and opinions that reflect the policymaking processes of the governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 615 at 5. A governmental body’s policymaking functions do not encompass routine internal administrative or personnel matters, and disclosure of information about such matters will not inhibit free discussion of policy issues among agency personnel. *Id.*; *see also City of Garland v. The Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351 (Tex. 2000) (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking). A governmental body’s policymaking functions do include administrative and personnel matters of broad scope that affect the governmental body’s policy mission. *See* Open Records Decision No. 631 at 3 (1995). Furthermore, section 552.111 does not protect facts and written observations of facts and events that are severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *See* Open Records Decision No. 615 at 5. But, if factual information is so inextricably intertwined with material involving advice, opinion, or recommendation as to make severance of the factual data impractical, the factual information also may be withheld under section 552.111. *See* Open Records Decision No. 313 at 3 (1982). When determining if an interagency memorandum is excepted from disclosure under section 552.111, we must consider whether the agencies between which the memorandum is passed share a privity of interest or common deliberative process with regard to the policy matter at issue. *See* Open Records Decision No. 561 at 9 (1990).

You state that the information in Exhibit B consists of e-mails sent by members of the commission, city staff and city council concerning the city’s proposed policy regarding the Dallas Police Department’s response to burglar alarms. You state that this information constitutes advice, recommendations, and opinions regarding this matter. After considering your arguments and reviewing the information at issue, we agree that the information in Exhibit B may be withheld from disclosure under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Section 552.101

encompasses the doctrine of common law. Common law privacy protects information if (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). The type of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. 540 S.W.2d at 683.

This office has found that the following type of information is excepted from required public disclosure under common law privacy: some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps). Therefore, the city must withhold the information we have marked in Exhibit D under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common law privacy.

You raise section 552.137 of the Government Code for portions of the remaining information. Section 552.137 makes certain e-mail addresses confidential. Section 552.137 provides in relevant part:

(a) Except as otherwise provided by this section, an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body is confidential and not subject to disclosure under this chapter.

(b) Confidential information described by this section that relates to a member of the public may be disclosed if the member of the public affirmatively consents to its release.

Gov't Code § 552.137. Under section 552.137, a governmental body must withhold the e-mail address of a member of the general public, unless the individual to whom the e-mail address belongs has affirmatively consented to its public disclosure. *See id.* § 552.137(b). You do not inform us that any of the individuals whose e-mail addresses are at issue have affirmatively consented to the release of their e-mail address. The city must, therefore, withhold marked e-mail addresses of members of the public under section 552.137.

In summary, the city must withhold Exhibit B under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The city must also withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common law privacy. Finally, the city must

withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Office of the Attorney General at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. Although there is no statutory deadline for

contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Matt McLain", written in a cursive style.

Matthew T. McLain  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

MM/jh

Ref: ID# 245240

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Matt Pulle  
Dallas Observer  
2501 Oaklawn, Suite 700  
Dallas, Texas 75219  
(w/o enclosures)