



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

September 26, 2012

Ms. L. Carolyn Nivens
Paralegal
Ross, Banks, May, Cron & Cavin, P.C.
2 Riverway, Suite 700
Houston, Texas 77056

OR2012-15372

Dear Ms. Nivens:

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# 466104 (Reference No. CSO# 12-226).

The City of League City (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for all documents, e-mails, correspondence, or forms addressing the prioritization of the 2013-2017 capital improvement budget, including a specified worksheet. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.106 and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

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 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, orig. proceeding); 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, orig. proceeding). We determined section 552.111 excepts from disclosure only those internal communications that consist of advice, opinions, recommendations, and other material reflecting 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. 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). Further, section 552.111 does not protect facts and written observations of facts and events that are severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.); 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).

You state the submitted information consists of communications, working drafts of capital improvement project worksheets, and drafts of the city's proposed tax supported programs priority worksheet. You further state the information at issue pertains to the city's ongoing budget process for the 2013-2017 fiscal years. Based on these representations and our review, we find the city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code.¹ However, you have not demonstrated how the remaining information consists of advice, opinion, or recommendations on a policy making matter. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Section 552.106 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[a] draft or working paper involved in the preparation of proposed legislation.” Gov't Code § 552.106(a). Section 552.106 of the Government Code resembles section 552.111 in that both exceptions protect advice, opinion, and recommendation on policy matters in order to encourage frank discussion during the policymaking process. See Open Records Decision No. 460 at 2 (1987). However, section 552.106 applies specifically to the legislative process and is

¹As our ruling is dispositive, we do not address your remaining claimed exception for this information.

narrower than section 552.111. *Id.* Therefore, section 552.106 is applicable only to the policy judgments, recommendations, and proposals of persons who are involved in the preparation of proposed legislation and who have an official responsibility to provide such information to members of the legislative body. *Id.* Section 552.106 does not protect purely factual information from public disclosure. *See id.*; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 344 at 3-4 (1982) (for purposes of statutory predecessor, factual information prepared by State Property Tax Board did not reflect policy judgments, recommendations, or proposals concerning drafting of legislation). Upon review of your arguments, we find you have not demonstrated the remaining information pertains to the preparation of proposed legislation. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.106 of the Government Code.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code 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).² Gov’t Code § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail addresses we have marked do not appear to be a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). The city must withhold the marked e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners of the addresses affirmatively consent to their release.³

In summary, the city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners of the addresses have affirmatively consented to their release. The remaining information must be released.

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,

²The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

³We note this office issued Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009), which serves as a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold ten categories of information, including an e-mail address of a member of the public under section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Nneka Kanu', written over a horizontal line.

Nneka Kanu
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

NK/bhf

Ref: ID# 466104

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)