



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 1, 2022

Mr. Trenton M. Dietz
Assistant City Attorney
City of Abilene
P.O. Box 60
Abilene, Texas 79604-0060

OR2022-37138

Dear Mr. Dietz:

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# 987368 (ORR# 22-1967).

The City of Abilene (the "city") received a request for all information related to a specified project. You state you have released some information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110, 552.1101, 552.111, and 552.137 of the Government Code. Additionally, you state release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of Jacob Martin LLC ("Jacob Martin"). Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified Jacob Martin of the request for information and of its 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.

Section 552.110 of the Government Code protects (1) trade secrets, and (2) commercial or financial information the disclosure of which would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(b)-(c). Although you argue the submitted information is excepted under section 552.110, this exception is designed to protect the interests of third parties, not the interests of a

governmental body. *See id.* §§ 552.110. In addition, although you raise section 552.1101 of the Government Code for the information at issue, this section protects only the interests of a vendor, contractor, potential vendor, or potential contractor that has provided information to a governmental body, not those of the governmental body itself. *See id.* § 552.1101(c). Thus, we do not address your arguments under section 552.110 or 552.1101. 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 id.* § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this ruling, we have not received comments from Jacob Martin. Thus, we have no basis to conclude Jacob Martin 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 portion of the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest Jacob Martin may have in the information.

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 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, 364 (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. *See 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 state the information at issue consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations of city employees regarding policymaking matters of the city. However, upon review, we find the remaining information at issue is general administrative and purely factual that does not rise to the level of policymaking. Thus, we find you have failed to demonstrate the information at issue constitutes internal communications containing advice, recommendations, or opinions reflecting the policymaking processes of the city. Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of the submitted information under section 552.111 of the Government Code on the basis of the deliberative process privilege.

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). Gov’t Code § 552.137(a)-(c). Section 552.137 does not apply to an institutional e-mail address, the general e-mail address of a business, an e-mail address of a person who has a contractual relationship with a governmental body, an e-mail address of a vendor who seeks to contract with a governmental body, an e-mail address maintained by a governmental entity for one of its officials or employees, or an e-mail address provided to a governmental body on a letterhead. *See id.* § 552.137(c). To the extent the e-mail addresses within the submitted information are the personal e-mail addresses of government officials or employees, or to the extent subsection (c) applies, this information is not subject to section 552.137 and may not be withheld on that basis. *See Austin Bulldog v. Leffingwell*, 490 S.W.3d 240 (Tex. App.—Austin 2016, no pet.) (holding personal e-mail addresses of government officials used to conduct official government business are not e-mail addresses of “members of the public” for purposes of Gov’t Code § 552.137(a)). However, to the extent the e-mail addresses within the submitted information are not the personal e-mail addresses of government officials or employees and subsection (c) does not apply, this information must be withheld under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners of the e-mail addresses affirmatively consent to their release. As no further exceptions to disclosure have been raised, 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,

Tim Neal
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

TN/pt

Ref: ID# 987368

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Third Party
(w/o enclosures)