



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 27, 2022

Ms. Raika Rowe
Counsel for the City of Pflugerville
Denton, Navarro, Rocha, Bernal & Zech, P.C.
2500 West William Cannon Drive, Suite 609
Austin, Texas 78745-5320

OR2022-18494

Dear Ms. Rowe:

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# 953390 (Ref. No. W013513).

The City of Pflugerville (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for a specified report and related appendices. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.111 of the Government Code. Additionally, you state release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of unspecified third parties. Accordingly, you state you notified these third parties of the request for information and of their 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 considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, 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 info relating to that party should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this ruling, we have not received comments from any of the notified third parties. Thus, we have no basis to conclude any of the notified third parties have 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 portion of the submitted

information on the basis of any proprietary interest the notified third parties may have in the information.

Next, we note section 552.301(e)(1)(D) of the Government Code states a governmental body asking for an attorney general decision must, within fifteen business days of receiving a request, provide the attorney general with “a copy of the specific information requested, *or submit representative samples of information if a voluminous amount of information was requested.*” *Id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (emphasis added). We note you submitted a voluminous amount of information consisting of over 11,000 pages of information rather than a representative sample. We have identified and reviewed a representative sample of the voluminous information at issue.¹

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” *Id.* § 552.101. This section encompasses information that is made confidential by other statutes. You raise section 552.101 in conjunction with section 418.181 of the Homeland Security Act (the “HSA”). Sections 418.176 through 418.182 were added to chapter 418 of the Government Code as part of the HSA. 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. The fact that information may relate to a governmental body’s security measures 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 of a statute’s key terms is not sufficient to demonstrate the applicability of the claimed provision. As with any exception to disclosure, a claim under section 418.181 must be accompanied by an adequate explanation of 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).

You assert the submitted information identifies the technical details of particular vulnerabilities of critical infrastructure to an act of terrorism. We agree the city’s traffic signal information is critical infrastructure for purposes of section 418.181. *See generally 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, economy, or morale of the state or the nation”). You assert the submitted information “includes detailed maps, models, and other digital data on specific calculations” and “releasing [the submitted] information would expose the vulnerabilities of the [c]ity’s critical infrastructure.” Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we find some of the submitted information is confidential under section 418.181 of the Government Code. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we marked and indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.181 of the Government Code.² However, we find you have failed to demonstrate the

¹ To the extent the city identifies confidential information subject to a provision not addressed in this ruling, the city should contact the Open Government Hotline.

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

remaining information identifies the technical details of particular vulnerabilities of critical infrastructure to an act of terrorism. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 542 (1990) (stating that governmental body has burden of establishing that exception applies to requested information), 532 (1989), 515 (1988), 252 (1980). Consequently, 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[.]” 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 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 seek to withhold the remaining information under section 552.111 of the Government Code. You state the information at issue consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations of city employees and officials regarding policymaking matters. Upon review, we find the city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, we find the remaining consists of information that is administrative or purely factual in nature. Thus, you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information reveals advice, opinions, or recommendations that pertain to policymaking. Accordingly,

the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.111 of the Government Code on the basis of the deliberative process privilege.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we marked and indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.181 of the Government Code. The city may withhold the information we 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 <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,

Chase D. Young
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CDY/eb

Ref: ID# 953390

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)