ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

March 3, 2008

Ms. Patricia E. Carls
Carls, McDonald, & Dalrymple, L.L.P.
Barton Oaks Plaza 2
901 South Mopac Expressway, Suite 500
Austin, Texas 78746

OR2008-02851

Dear Ms. Carls:

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 #303482.

The City of Sunset Valley (the "city") received a request for three categories of information pertaining to the city's peer review process, including the audio recording of the city council meeting in which this review process was discussed. You state that no such audio recording exists.[1] You state that you are releasing some information to the requestor. You claim that the submitted survey instructions and responses, which are responsive to the other two categories of this request, are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.111 and 552.116 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative samples of information.[2]

---

[1]The Act does not require a governmental body that receives a request for information to create information that did not exist when the request was received. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dism'd); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 563 at 8 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990).

[2]We assume that the representative sample of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

Section 552.111 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure "an interagency or intra-agency 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, 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* ORD 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* ORD 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).

Upon review, we find that the submitted survey responses do not contain any advice, opinions, or recommendations regarding any potential policy change by the city. As the documents themselves indicate, they are merely city employees' opinions of their peers' professional abilities. You inform this office that the city "has been engaged in a review and restructuring of its organizational structure, internal working relationships, and departments for approximately 6-9 months." You state that the survey responses at issue "are intended to assist with that on-going work of the [c]ity [c]ouncil," and that the council has not yet finished implementing policies that address the issues raised in the survey. However, we note that the fact that a document assists the policymaking process does not necessarily make it subject to section 552.111. *See* ORD 615 at 6. As stated above, only the actual advice or opinions regarding policymaking may be withheld under this exception. *Id.* Accordingly, none of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.111.

Section 552.116 of the Government Code provides as follows:

> (a) An audit working paper of an audit of the state auditor or the auditor of a state agency, an institution of higher education as defined by Section 61.003, Education Code, a county, a municipality, a school district, or a joint board operating under Section 22.074, Transportation Code, including any audit relating to the criminal history background check of a public school employee, is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021. If information in an audit working paper is also maintained in another record, that other record is not excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 by this section.
>
> (b) In this section:
>
> > (1) 'Audit' means an audit authorized or required by a statute of this state or the United States, the charter or an ordinance of a municipality, an order of the commissioners court of a county, a resolution or other action of a board of trustees of a school district, including an audit by the district relating to the criminal history background check of a public school employee, or a resolution or other action of a joint board described by Subsection (a) and includes an investigation.
> >
> > (2) 'Audit working paper' includes all information, documentary or otherwise, prepared or maintained in conducting an audit or preparing an audit report, including:
> >
> > > (A) intra-agency and interagency communications; and
> > >
> > > (B) drafts of the audit report or portions of those drafts.

Gov't Code § 552.116. You state, and provide documentation showing, that the submitted survey responses pertain to a peer evaluation authorized by the city council. However, for municipalities like the city, only working papers relating to audits authorized by statute, municipal charter, or ordinance are protected under section 552.116. *See id.* § 552.116(b)(1). You do not inform us, and the documents do not reflect, that this survey was conducted as an audit authorized in accordance with section 552.116(b)(1). Accordingly, no information may be withheld as audit working papers under section 552.116.

Section 552.137 excepts from disclosure "an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body" unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type

specifically excluded by subsection (c).[3] Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail address that we have marked does not appear to be of a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). Assuming that the relevant member of the public has not consented to the release of the e-mail address, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.137.

In summary, unless it received consent for its release, the city must withhold the e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released to the requestor.

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 file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, 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 challenge 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).

---

[3]The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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,

Reg Hargrove
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

RJH/eeg

Ref: ID# 303482

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Bruce Smith
c/o Patricia E. Carls
Carls, Mcdonald, & Dalrymple, L.l.p.
901 South Mopac Expressway, Suite 500
Austin, Texas 78746
(w/o enclosures)