



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 5, 2022

Ms. Kristine Nguyen
Assistant City Attorney
City of Dallas
1500 Marilla Street, Room 5DS
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2022-09918

Dear Ms. Nguyen:

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# 939976 (Ref No. C000305-011122).

The City of Dallas (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified request for proposals. You state the city will release some information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.104 and 552.111 of the Government Code. Additionally, the city states release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of Accenture, LLP; Ardalyt Federal, LLC; AT&T Corp; CDW Government, LLC ("CDW"); Cyber Watch Systems, LLC ("Cyber Watch"); International Business Machines Corporation; IntSights Cyber Threat Intelligence, Inc.; MGT of America Consulting, LLC; Motorola Solutions, Inc.; Raytheon Company; SignumVeri, LLC; Schneider Electric Buildings Americas; Verizon Business Services; and WizNucleus, Inc. Accordingly, the city states, and provides documentation showing, it notified these third parties of the request for information and of the right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in the Act in certain circumstances). We have received comments from CDW and Cyber Watch. We have reviewed the submitted information and considered the submitted arguments.

Cyber Watch asserts its information is not "public information" subject to disclosure under the Act. We note, however, that section 552.002(a) of the Government Code defines "public information" 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;

(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.

Gov't Code § 552.002(a). Thus, virtually all the information in a governmental body's physical possession constitutes public information and is subject to the Act. *See id.* § 552.002(a)(1); *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 549 at 4 (1990), 514 at 1-2 (1988). Cyber Watch asserts its information is not subject to the Act because the city does "own the requested Request for Proposal or spend or contribute public money for the purpose of writing, producing, collecting, assembling or maintaining the requested Request for Proposal." However, we find the information at issue consists of information that is maintained by the city for the transaction of its official business. Therefore, the information at issue is subject to the Act, and the city must release it, unless it is excepted from release under the Act.

Next, we note CDW argues against the release of information that was not submitted by the city. This ruling does not address information that was not submitted by the city and is limited to the information the city has submitted for our review. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body requesting decision from attorney general must submit copy of specific information requested).

Further, we note an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should not be released. *See id.* § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this ruling, we have only received comments from CDW and Cyber Watch. Thus, we have no basis to conclude any of the remaining interested third parties has a protected proprietary interest in the submitted information. *See, e.g., id.* § 552.110 (requiring the provision of specific factual evidence demonstrating the applicability of the exception). Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest any of the remaining interested third parties may have in the information.

Section 552.104(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information that a governmental body demonstrates, if released, would "harm its interests by providing an advantage to a competitor or bidder in a particular ongoing competitive situation or in a

particular competitive situation where the governmental body establishes the situation at issue is set to reoccur or there is a specific and demonstrable intent to enter into the competitive situation again in the future.” *Id.* § 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, 841 (Tex. 2015). After review of the information at issue and consideration of the arguments, we find the city has failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.104 to the information at issue. Thus, we conclude the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.104(a) 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[.]” 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, no writ); 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 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 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.

You assert Exhibit D reflects the advice, recommendations, and opinions of city employees regarding policymaking decisions. Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we find the city has demonstrated the information at issue consists of advice, opinions, or recommendations on the policymaking matters of the city. Thus, we find the city may withhold Exhibit D under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Section 552.110(b) of the Government Code states, “[e]xcept as provided by [s]ection 552.0222, information is [excepted from required disclosure] if it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that the information is a trade secret.” Gov’t Code § 552.110(b). Section 552.110(a) defines a trade secret as all forms and types of information if:

- (1) the owner of the trade secret has taken reasonable measures under the circumstances to keep the information secret; and
- (2) the information derives independent economic value, actual or potential, from not being generally known to, and not being readily ascertainable through proper means by, another person who can obtain economic value from the disclosure or use of the information.

Id. § 552.110(a). Section 552.110(c) of the Government Code states:

Except as provided by Section 552.0222, 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 is [excepted from required disclosure].

Id. § 552.110(c). Additionally, we note section 552.0222(b) lists certain types of information to which section 552.110 does not apply. *See id.* § 552.0222(b). CDW and Cyber Watch argue portions of the information at issue consists of trade secrets subject to section 552.110(b) and commercial or financial information subject to section 552.110(c). Upon review, we find CDW and Cyber Watch have demonstrated portions of the information at issue constitute commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause substantial competitive harm. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.110(c) of the Government Code; however to the extent CDW’s customer information at issue is made available to the public by CDW, include but not limited to on its website or social media accounts, such information may not be withheld under section 552.110(c) of the Government Code.¹ However, we find some of the remaining information at issue is subject to section 552.0222(b) and may not be withheld on the bases of either section 552.110(b) or section 552.110(c). Additionally, we find Cyber Watch has failed to provide specific factual evidence demonstrating the remaining information at issue is a trade secret or constitutes commercial or financial

¹ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

information, the release of which would result in substantial competitive harm. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.110 of the Government Code.

Cyber Watch raises section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code for some of the remaining information. 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. *See id.* § 552.117(a)(1). Upon review, we find Cyber Watch has failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code to the remaining information at issue. Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information at issue under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides, “Notwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential.”² *Id.* § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). This office has determined insurance policy numbers are access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. *See Open Records Decision No. 684 at 9 (2009)*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the insurance policy numbers within the remaining information under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

We note some of the remaining information appears to be protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. *Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977)*. A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; *see Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975)*. If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit.

In summary, the city may withhold Exhibit D under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.110(c) of the Government Code; however to the extent CDW’s customer information at issue is made available to the public by CDW, include but not limited to on its website or social media accounts, such information may not be withheld under section 552.110(c) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the insurance policy numbers within the remaining information under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information; however, any information that is subject to copyright may be released only in accordance with copyright law.

² 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,

D. Michelle Case
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

DMH/jxd

Ref: ID# 939976

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

13 Third Parties
(w/o enclosures)