



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 9, 2020

Ms. Cynthia Trevino
Counsel for the City of Schertz
Denton, Navarro, Rocha & Bernal Pc
2517 North Main Avenue
San Antonio, Texas 78212-4481

OR2020-25430

Dear Ms. Schertz:

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# 845494 (PIA 20-155/66101604).

The City of Schertz (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information related to a specified location. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.111 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This section encompasses information protected by other statutes. Sections 418.176 through 418.182 were added to chapter 418 of the Government Code as part of the Texas Homeland Security Act ("HSA"). The city claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 418.181 of the Government Code. Section 418.181 provides "[t]hose documents or portions of documents in the possession of a governmental entity are confidential if they identify the technical details of particular vulnerabilities of critical infrastructure to an act of terrorism." *Id.* § 418.181; *see also id.* § 421.001 (defining critical infrastructure to include "all public or private assets, systems, and functions vital to the security, governance, public health and safety, and functions vital

¹ We note we asked the city to provide additional information pursuant to section 552.303 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.303(c)-(d) (if attorney general determines information in addition to that required by section 552.301 is necessary to render decision, written notice of that fact shall be given to governmental body and requestor, and governmental body shall submit necessary additional information to attorney general not later than seventh calendar day after date of receipt of notice). We have received and considered the correspondence sent by the city pursuant to that request.

to the state or the nation”). The fact that information may relate to a governmental body’s security concerns or emergency management activities does not make the information *per se* confidential under the HSA. *See* Open Records Decision No. 649 at 3 (1996) (language of confidentiality provision controls scope of its protection). Furthermore, the mere recitation by a governmental body of a statute’s key terms is not sufficient to demonstrate the applicability of a claimed provision. As with any exception to disclosure, a governmental body asserting one of the confidentiality provisions of the HSA must adequately explain how the responsive records fall within the scope of the claimed provision. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must explain how claimed exception to disclosure applies).

The city states the submitted information consists of construction plans that identify the current water and sewer lines related to the construction of a city school. Further, we note the submitted information contains the location and technical details of a school. Upon review, we agree the city’s schools, water, and sewer systems are part of the city’s critical infrastructure. *See id.* § 421.001(2). The city argues public disclosure of the information would reveal vulnerabilities of the city’s critical infrastructure. Thus, we understand the city claims the information could be used to identify the technical details of particular vulnerabilities of the city’s water and sewer systems and schools to an act of terrorism. Based on these representations and our review, we agree some of the requested information identifies the technical details of particular vulnerabilities of critical infrastructure to an act of terrorism. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.181 of the Government Code.² However, we find the city has failed to demonstrate the remaining information is confidential under section 418.181 of the Government Code. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.181 of the Government Code.

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[.]” *Id.* § 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

² As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

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).

This office has also concluded a preliminary draft of a document that is intended for public release in its final form necessarily represents the drafter's advice, opinion, and recommendation with regard to the form and content of the final document, so as to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.111. See Open Records Decision No. 559 at 2 (1990) (applying statutory predecessor). Section 552.111 protects factual information in the draft that also will be included in the final version of the document. See *id.* at 2-3. Thus, section 552.111 encompasses the entire contents, including comments, underlining, deletions, and proofreading marks, of a preliminary draft of a policymaking document that will be released to the public in its final form. See *id.* at 2.

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 ORD 561. (We note a governmental body does not share a privity of interest with a third party when the governmental body and the third party are involved in contract negotiations, as the parties' interests are adverse.)

You generally assert the remaining information consists of draft documents prepared by city employees. Upon review, however, we find the information at issue is general administrative and purely factual information or has been shared with an individual with whom you have not demonstrated the city shares a privity of interest. Thus, we find you have failed to show how the information at issue consists of advice, opinions, or recommendations on the policymaking matters of the city. Accordingly, the remaining information at issue may not be withheld under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home address and telephone number, emergency contact information, social security number, and family

member information of a current or former employee or official of a governmental body who requests this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code.³ *See* Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). Section 552.117 is applicable to cellular telephone numbers, provided the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-6 (1988) (statutory predecessor to section 552.117 not applicable to cellular telephone numbers provided and paid for by governmental body and intended for official use). Whether a particular item of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Thus, information may be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) only on behalf of a current or former employee or official who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. Accordingly, if the individuals whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality pursuant to section 552.024 of the Government Code, the city must withhold the cellular telephone numbers of city employees under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the cellular telephone numbers may only be withheld if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service.

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).⁴ *See* Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail addresses at issue do not appear to be the type specifically excluded by subsection (c). Accordingly, the city must withhold the personal e-mail addresses in the remaining information under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.181 of the Government Code. If the individuals whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality pursuant to section 552.024 of the Government Code, the city must withhold the cellular telephone numbers of city employees under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the cellular telephone numbers may only be withheld if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service. The city must withhold the personal e-mail addresses in the remaining information under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure. The city must release the remaining information.

³ The 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).

⁴ The 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).

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,

Sean McCormick
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

SMC/eb

Ref: ID# 845494

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)