



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 18, 2022

Ms. Tessa K. Meredith  
Counsel for the City of Mineral Wells  
Messer, Fort & McDonald  
6371 Preston Road, Suite 200  
Frisco, Texas 75034

OR2022-20723

Dear Ms. Meredith:

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# 958624 (ORR ID: MW012822RS).

The City of Mineral Wells (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for six categories of information pertaining to a specified request for proposals.<sup>1</sup> You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.104 and 552.111 of the Government Code. You also state release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of third parties. Accordingly, you state you notified the third parties at issue 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> You state the city sought and received clarification of the request for information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (stating if information requested is unclear to governmental body or if large amount of information has been requested, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify or narrow request, but may not inquire into purpose for which information will be used); *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380 (Tex. 2010) (holding when governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification of unclear or overbroad request for public information, ten-business-day period to request attorney general opinion is measured from date request is clarified or narrowed). You inform us the city sent the requestor an estimate of charges pursuant to section 552.2615 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.2615. The estimate of charges required the requestor to provide a deposit for payment of anticipated costs under section 552.263 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.263(a). You inform us the city received the required deposit on April 28, 2022. *See id.* § 552.263(e) (if governmental body requires deposit or bond for anticipated costs pursuant to section 552.263, request for information is considered to have been received on date governmental body receives bond or deposit).

Initially, we note an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received comments from any of the third parties at issue explaining why their information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude any of the 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 of the information at issue on the basis of any proprietary interest the third parties at issue may have in it.

Next, we note the submitted information includes a contract subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides, in relevant part:

[T]he following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

...

(3) information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of public or other funds by a governmental body[.]

*Id.* § 552.022(a)(3). Thus, the submitted contract is subject to section 552.022(a)(3) and must be released unless it is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* You seek to withhold the contract under sections 552.104 and 552.111 of the Government Code. However, section 552.111 is discretionary in nature and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions), 470 at 7 (1987) (statutory predecessor to section 552.111 subject to waiver). Therefore, the city may not withhold the contract under section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, information encompassed by section 552.022 may be withheld under section 552.104. *See* Gov't Code § 552.104(b) (information protected by section 552.104 not subject to required public disclosure under section 552.022(a)). Accordingly, we will consider your argument under section 552.104 of the Government Code for the contract subject to section 552.022(a)(3) of the Government Code, which we have marked. We will also consider your arguments against disclosure of the remaining 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." 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, 841 (Tex. 2015). Based upon your representations and our review, we find you have failed to demonstrate the city has specific marketplace interests in the information at issue for purposes of section 552.104. Accordingly, 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, 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; *see also City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351, 364 (Tex. 2000); *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.). 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). However, 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. ORD 615 at 5-6; *see also Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d at 364 (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking).

Further, section 552.111 does not protect facts and written observations of facts and events severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *See Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 37 S.W.3d at 157; 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).

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 id.* 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. *See id.* (Section 552.111 not applicable to communication with entity with which governmental body has no privity of interest or common deliberative process).

The city states the information not subject to section 552.022(a)(3) consists of communications containing advice, opinions, and recommendations of city employees and a third party consultant for the city. Based upon the city's representations and our review of the information at issue, we find the city has demonstrated some of the information at issue consists of advice, opinions, or recommendations on the policymaking matters of the city. Accordingly, the city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, we find some of the remaining information at issue pertains to contract negotiations between the city and third parties; thus, the interests of the city and the third parties at issue were adverse as to the negotiations and there is no privity of interest between the parties with respect to this information. Additionally, we find the remaining information at issue is either general administrative information that does not relate to policymaking or is information that is purely factual in nature. Thus, the city has failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue pertains to policymaking matters of the city for the purposes of section 552.111. Therefore, the city may not withhold the remaining information at issue under section 552.111.

We note some of the remaining information is subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> Section 552.136 states that "[n]otwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, 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." Gov't Code § 552.136. This office has concluded insurance policy numbers constitute access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. Accordingly, we find the city must withhold the submitted insurance policy numbers under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the submitted insurance policy numbers under section 552.136 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.

---

<sup>2</sup> The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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,

Jennifer Copeland  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JC/jxd

Ref: ID# 958624

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)