



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 21, 2016

Mr. Jeffrey Giles  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Houston  
P.O. Box 368  
Houston, Texas 77001-0368

OR2016-14027

Dear Mr. Giles:

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# 615010 (GC Nos. 23219 and 23226).

The City of Houston (the "city") received a request for the cellular telephone records of a named individual and e-mail communications of that named individual and another named individual during specified time periods. You state the city does not possess the requested cellular telephone records.<sup>1</sup> You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.104, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>2</sup>

---

<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 or to prepare new information in response to a request. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266, 267-68 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

<sup>2</sup>We assume 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 those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

Section 552.104(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder.” Gov’t Code § 552.104(a). The “test under section 552.104 is whether knowing another bidder’s [or competitor’s information] would be an advantage, not whether it would be a decisive advantage.” *Boeing Co. v. Paxton*, 466 S.W.3d 831 (Tex. 2015). You represent the information in Exhibit 2 pertains to a competitive bidding situation. In addition, you assert release of Exhibit 2 would negatively impact negotiations between the city and the selected bidder. You further assert release of the submitted information would impact the prices future bidders offer and harm the city’s ability to obtain the lowest price possible in the current or any future related bidding process. After review of the information at issue and consideration of the arguments, we find the city has established the release of the information at issue would give advantage to a competitor or bidder. Thus, we conclude the city may withhold Exhibit 2 under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup>

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, 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. *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, 364 (Tex. 2000) (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking). A governmental body’s policymaking functions 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, 157 (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, section 552.111 protects the factual information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 313 at 3 (1982).

---

<sup>3</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of Exhibit 2.

You assert the remaining information consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations relating to the city's policymaking. Upon review, we find some of this information, which we have marked, consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations pertaining to a policymaking matter. Accordingly, the city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, we find the remaining information consists of either general administrative information that does not relate to policymaking or information that is purely factual in nature. Thus, we find the city has failed to demonstrate the remaining information is excepted under section 552.111. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the remaining information section 552.111 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city may withhold Exhibit 2 under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code. The city may withhold the information we have marked 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](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,



Lee Seidlits  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CLS/bw

Ref: ID# 615010

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)