



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

May 9, 2014

Mr. Charles R. Anderson
City Attorney
City of Irving
825 West Irving Boulevard
Irving, Texas 75060

OR2014-07932

Dear Mr. Anderson:

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# 522067.

The City of Irving (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified proposal involving the modification of the city's property tax exemption for a specified period of time. You state the city has released some information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.105, 552.107, 552.110, 552.111, and 552.131 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative samples of information.²

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides, in relevant part, the following:

¹Although you raise rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence, we note section 552.107 of the Government Code is the proper exception to raise when asserting the attorney-client privilege for information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 1-2 (2002). Further, although you raise rule 192.3 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure, you have provided no arguments explaining how this rule is applicable. Therefore, we assume you have withdrawn your claim this rule applies to the submitted information. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302.

²We assume the "representative samples" 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 those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

...

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). A governmental body claiming section 552.103 has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received the request, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, orig. proceeding); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). The governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a). ORD 551 at 4.

You assert the information submitted in Exhibit B relates to pending litigation. You state, and provide documentation showing, a writ of mandamus suit styled *In re Herbert Grears*, Cause No. 05-14-00187-CV, was filed against the city in the Court of Appeals for the Fifth District at Dallas, prior to the city's receipt of the instant request for information. Thus, we find litigation was pending against the city at the time it received the request. Moreover, we find the information at issue is related to the pending litigation for purposes of section 552.103. Accordingly, the city may withhold Exhibit B under section 552.103 of the Government Code.³

We note, however, once information has been obtained by all parties to the pending litigation through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends when the litigation has concluded or is no longer reasonably anticipated. *See* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 at 2; Open Records Decision Nos. 350 at 3 (1982), 349 at 2.

³As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

Section 552.111 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[a]n 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. This exception 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, writ ref’d n.r.e.); 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 section 552.111 excepts from disclosure only those internal communications that consist of advice, recommendations, opinions, and other material reflecting the policymaking processes of a 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 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 may also be withheld under section 552.111. *See* Open Records Decision No. 313 at 3 (1982).

You state the information submitted in Exhibit D consists of the advice, opinion, and recommendation related to the city’s policymaking. You inform us the parties involved in the communication are city employees. Upon review, we find Exhibit D consists of advice, opinion, and recommendation on the city’s policymaking matters. Therefore, the city may withhold Exhibit D under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Section 552.105 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information relating to:

- (1) the location of real or personal property for a public purpose prior to public announcement of the project; or
- (2) appraisals or purchase price of real or personal property for a public purpose prior to the formal award of contracts for the property.

Gov't Code § 552.105. We note this provision is designed to protect a governmental body's planning and negotiating position with regard to particular transactions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 564 at 2 (1990), 357 (1982), 310 (1982). Information that pertains to such negotiations may be excepted from disclosure so long as the transaction relating to that information is not complete. *See* ORD 310 at 2. A governmental body may withhold information "which, if released, would impair or tend to impair [its] 'planning and negotiating position in regard to particular transactions.'" Open Records Decision Nos. 357 at 3, 222 (1979). The question of whether specific information, if publicly released, would impair a governmental body's planning and negotiating position with regard to particular transactions is a question of fact. Accordingly, this office will accept a governmental body's good-faith determination in this regard, unless the contrary is clearly shown as a matter of law. *See* ORD 564. Upon review, we find no portion of the remaining information pertains to the location, appraisal, or purchase price of real or personal property for a public purpose. *See* ORD 310 (statutory predecessor to section 552.105 protects information relating to the location, appraisals, and purchase price of property to be purchased by governmental body for public purpose). Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.105 of the Government Code.

You also claim the remaining information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110 protects (1) trade secrets, and (2) commercial or financial information the disclosure of which would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(a)-(b). We note, however, section 552.110 is designed to protect the interests of third parties, not the interests of a governmental body. In this instance, there has been no demonstration by a third party that any of the information at issue constitutes a trade secret or that release of any of the information at issue would cause a third party substantial competitive harm. *See generally* Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm), 552 at 5 (1990) (attorney general will accept private person's claim under section 552.110(a) if person establishes *prima facie* case for trade secret exception, and no one submits argument that rebuts claim as matter of law). Thus, the city may not withhold the remaining information on the basis of section 552.110 of the Government Code.

Section 552.131 of the Government Code provides, in part, as follows:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if the information relates to economic development negotiations involving a governmental body and a business prospect that the governmental body seeks to have locate, stay, or expand in or near the territory of the governmental body and the information relates to:

- (1) a trade secret of the business prospect; or
- (2) commercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that disclosure would cause

substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained.

Gov't Code § 552.131(a). Section 552.131(a) only protects the proprietary interests of third parties that have provided information to governmental bodies, not the interests of governmental bodies themselves. As noted above, there has been no demonstration by a third party that any of the information at issue constitutes a trade secret or release of the information at issue would cause a third party substantial competitive harm. We therefore conclude that the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.131(a) of the Government Code.

In summary, the city may withhold Exhibit B under section 552.103 of the Government Code. The city may withhold Exhibit D under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining 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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, 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 may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Miriam A. Khalifa
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MAK/akg

Ref: ID# 522067

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)