



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

August 18, 2011

Ms. Mari M. McGowan
Abernathy Roeder Boyd & Joplin P.C.
P.O. Box 1210
McKinney, Texas 75070-1210

OR2011-11997

Dear Ms. McGowan:

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# 427394.

The North Central Texas College (the "college"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to two specified media publications and communications regarding a specified subject matter.¹ You state the college has released some of the requested information. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially we note the requestor states he does not object to the college redacting any private e-mail addresses from the requested information. Therefore, this type of information is not responsive to the present request for information. This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the request, and the college need not release such information.

¹You state the college sought and received clarification of the request for information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (stating that if information requested is unclear to governmental body or if a large amount of information has been requested, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify or narrow request, but may not inquire into purpose for which information will be used); *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification of unclear or overbroad request for public information, ten-business-day period to request attorney general opinion is measured from date the request is clarified or narrowed).

Section 552.111 of the Government Code excepts from 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 section 552.111 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, orig. proceeding); Open Records Decision No. 538 at 1-2 (1990).

In Open Records Decision No. 615, this office reexamined 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, orig. proceeding). We determined section 552.111 excepts from disclosure only those internal communications that consist of advice, recommendations, opinions, and other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the governmental body. ORD 615 at 5; *see also City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351, 364 (Tex. 2000); *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Texas Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.). 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). However, 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. ORD 615 at 5-6; *see also Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d at 364 (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking). Further, section 552.111 does not generally except from disclosure facts and written observations of facts and events that are severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 37 S.W.3d at 157; 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).

Section 552.111 can also encompass communications between a governmental body and a third-party, including a consultant or other party with a privity of interest. *See* Open Records Decision No. 561 at 9 (1990) (section 552.111 encompasses communications with party with which governmental body has privity of interest or common deliberative process). For section 552.111 to apply, the governmental body must identify the third party and explain the nature of its relationship with the governmental body. Section 552.111 is not applicable to a communication between the governmental body and a third party unless the governmental body establishes it has a privity of interest or common deliberative process with the third party. *See id.* We note a governmental body does not have a privity of interest or common deliberative process with a private party with which the governmental body is engaged in contract negotiations. *See id.* (section 552.111 not applicable to communication with entity with which governmental body has no privity of interest or common deliberative process).

You contend the submitted e-mail communications are protected by the deliberative process privilege because they contain advice, opinion, and recommendation relating to the college's policy matters. Upon review, we find some of the information constitutes advice, opinion, and recommendation between the college's officials, administration, and committee members regarding the college's policymaking processes. Thus, the college may withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.111. However, we find some of the remaining communications either involve one of two individuals who are not identified or involve another individual regarding contract negotiations between the college and the third party. As such, there is no privity of interest or common deliberative process between any of these individuals and the college. Furthermore, we find the remaining communications do not contain advice, opinion, or recommendation. Therefore, we find you have failed to demonstrate how the deliberative process privilege applies to the remaining information. Accordingly the college may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.111. As you raise no further exceptions to disclosure, we determine you must release the remaining responsive information.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information 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 information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php, or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General, toll free at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Lindsay E. Hale
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LEH/bs

Ref: ID# 427394

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)