



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 20, 2020

Ms. Cynthia Trevino
Counsel for City of Garden Ridge
Denton Navarro Rocha Bernal & Zech, P.C.
2517 North Main Avenue
San Antonio, Texas 78212-4685

OR2020-21000

Dear Ms. Trevino:

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# 839950 (PIA 20-130).

The City of Garden Ridge (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a specified report and invoice. You claim the submitted information is not subject to the Act. You also claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information. We have also received and considered comments from the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Initially, we address your claim the submitted information is not subject to the Act. The Act applies to "public information," which is defined in section 552.002(a) of the Government Code as

information that is written, produced, collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business:

(1) by a governmental body; or

(2) for a governmental body and the governmental body:

(A) owns the information;

(B) has a right of access to the information; or

(C) spends or contributes public money for the purpose of writing, producing, collecting, assembling, or maintaining the information; or

(3) by an individual officer or employee of a governmental body in the officer's or employee's official capacity and the information pertains to official business of the governmental body.

Id. § 552.002(a). Information is “in connection with the transaction of official business” if it is “created by, transmitted to, received by, or maintained by an officer or employee of the governmental body in the officer’s or employee’s official capacity, or a person or entity performing official business or a government function on behalf of a governmental body, and pertains to official business of the governmental body.” *Id.* § 552.002(a-1). Thus, virtually all of the information in a governmental body’s physical possession constitutes public information and is subject to the Act. *Id.* § 552.002(a)(1); *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 549 at 4 (1990), 514 at 1-2 (1988). You explain the submitted information consists of incomplete and draft documents related to a pending internal personnel investigation. We understand you to argue that because the submitted information is not subject to section 552.022(a)(1), it is also not subject to the Act. Section 552.022(a)(1) provides for the required public disclosure of “a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body[,]” unless it is excepted by section 552.108 of the Government Code or “made confidential under [the Act] or other law. Gov’t Code § 552.022(a)(1). We note, however, section 552.022 does not limit “the amount or kind of information that is public information.” *Id.* § 552.022. Based on our review, we find the submitted information was written, produced, collected, assembled, or maintained by the city in connection with the city’s official business. Thus, we find the submitted information is subject to the Act and the city must release it unless the information falls within an exception to public disclosure under the Act. *Id.* §§ 552.006, .021, .301, .302. Accordingly, we will address your arguments against disclosure.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” *Id.* § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683.

In this instance, although we agree some of the submitted information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*, we note this information pertains to the requestor. Section 552.023 of the Government Code gives a person a special

right of access to information that is excepted from public disclosure under laws intended to protect that person's privacy interests. *See generally* Gov't Code § 552.023; Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individuals request information concerning themselves). Therefore, the requestor has a special right of access to his own private information, and the city may not withhold information pertaining to the requestor under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. Further, the city has failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and a matter of no legitimate public interest. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

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 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 assert the submitted information consists of internal deliberations among city staff and officials. Upon review, we find the information at issue either pertains to internal administrative or personnel matters that do not rise to the level of policymaking or is purely factual in nature. Thus, we find you have failed to demonstrate the information reveals advice, opinions, or recommendations that pertain to policymaking. Accordingly, the city

may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.111 and the deliberative process privilege. The city must release the submitted information.¹

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 <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open-government/members-public/what-expect-after-ruling-issued> or call the OAG's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Public Information Act may be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the OAG, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

Meagan Hunter
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MH/jm

Ref: ID# 839950

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

¹ We note the requestor has a right of access to some of the information being released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a); ORD 481 at 4. Thus, if the city receives another request for the same information from a different requestor, the city must again seek a decision from this office.