



June 13, 2002

Ms. Nydia D. Thomas
Staff Attorney
Texas Juvenile Probation Commission
P.O. Box 13547
Austin, Texas 78711-2548

OR2002-3192

Dear Ms. Thomas:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 164330.

The Texas Juvenile Probation Commission (the "commission") received a request for eight categories of information pertaining to juvenile "boot camps." You state that some responsive information has been released to the requestor. You inform us that no responsive information exists pertaining to a portion of the request. The Public Information Act does not require a governmental body to disclose information that did not exist at the time the request was received, nor does it require a governmental body to prepare new information in response to a request. *Economic Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.--San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Attorney General Opinion H-90 (1973); Open Records Decision Nos. 452 at 2-3 (1986), 342 at 3 (1982), 87 (1975); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 572 at 1 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990), 416 at 5 (1984). You claim that parts of the requested information are exempted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.106, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

¹We assume that the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Section 261.201(a) of the Family Code provides as follows:

(a) The following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under Chapter 552, Government Code, and may be disclosed only for purposes consistent with this code and applicable federal or state law or under rules adopted by an investigating agency:

(1) a report of alleged or suspected abuse or neglect made under this chapter and the identity of the person making the report;

and

(2) except as otherwise provided in this section, the files, reports, records, communications, and working papers used or developed in an investigation under this chapter or in providing services as a result of an investigation.

Because a portion of the requested documents relates to an allegation of child abuse, those documents are within the scope of section 261.201 of the Family Code. You have not indicated that the commission has adopted a rule that governs the release of this type of information. Therefore, we assume that no such regulation exists. Given that assumption, the documents that we have marked are confidential pursuant to section 261.201 of the Family Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 440 at 2 (1986) (predecessor statute). Accordingly, the commission must withhold these documents from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code as information made confidential by law.

You next argue that preparatory documents responsive to category 1 and information responsive to category 2 of the request are excepted from public disclosure under section 552.111 of the Government Code. Section 552.111 excepts from disclosure “an interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency.” In Open Records Decision No. 615 (1993), this office reexamined the predecessor to the section 552.111 exception in light of the decision in *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408 (Tex. App.--Austin 1992, no writ), and held that section 552.111 excepts only those internal communications consisting of advice, recommendations, opinions, and other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the governmental body. *City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351, 364 (Tex. 2000); *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Texas Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.--Austin 2001, no pet.). An agency’s policymaking functions do not encompass internal administrative or personnel matters; disclosure of information relating to such matters will not inhibit free discussion among agency personnel as to policy issues. ORD 615 at 5-6. Additionally, section 552.111 does not generally except from disclosure purely factual information that is severable from the opinion portions of internal memoranda.

Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist., 37 S.W.3d at 160; ORD 615 at 4-5. The preliminary draft of a policymaking document that has been released or is intended for release in final form is excepted from disclosure in its entirety under section 552.111 because such a draft necessarily represents the advice, recommendations, or opinions of the drafter as to the form and content of the final document. Open Records Decision No. 559 at 2 (1990).

You state that the information at issue reflects internal recommendations and opinions of commission decision-makers concerning issues of a policymaking nature and that the disclosure of such information would inhibit free discussion among agency personnel as to policy issues. Based on our review of your arguments and the submitted information, we agree that most of the information constitutes communications among agency personnel that consist of advice, opinions, and recommendations reflecting the policymaking processes of the commission. Accordingly, we conclude that the documents that we have marked may be withheld from disclosure under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

We next address your section 552.106 argument for the remainder of the submitted information. Section 552.106 excepts from disclosure “[a] draft or working paper involved in the preparation of proposed legislation” and “[a]n internal bill analysis or working paper prepared by the governor’s office for the purpose of evaluating proposed legislation.” Section 552.106 ordinarily applies only to persons with a responsibility to prepare information and proposals for a legislative body. Open Records Decision No. 460 (1987). The purpose of section 552.106 is to encourage frank discussion on policy matters between the subordinates or advisors of a legislative body and the members of the legislative body, and therefore, it does not except from disclosure purely factual information. *Id.* at 2. However, a comparison or analysis of factual information prepared to support proposed legislation is within the ambit of section 552.106. *Id.* A proposed budget constitutes a recommendation by its very nature and may be withheld under section 552.106. *Id.* This office has also concluded that the drafts of municipal ordinances and resolutions which reflect policy judgments, recommendations, and proposals are excepted by section 552.106. Open Records Decision No. 248 (1980).

We note that sections 552.111 and 552.106 are similar in that they both protect advice, opinion, and recommendation on policy matters in order to encourage frank discussion during the policymaking process. Open Records Decision No. 460 at 3 (1987). However, section 552.106 is narrower than section 552.111 in that it applies specifically to the legislative process. *Id.* Having considered your argument and reviewed the documents at issue, we find that the remaining information does not constitute a draft or working paper involved in the preparation of proposed legislation. Thus, section 552.106 is not applicable, and the remaining submitted information must be released to the requestor.

In summary, the documents that we have marked are confidential pursuant to section 261.201 of the Family Code, and must be withheld from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code as information made confidential by law. The

commission may withhold the marked documents under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The remainder of the submitted information must be released to the requestor.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at 877/673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.--Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at 512/475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code

§ 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Cindy Nettles".

Cindy Nettles
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CN/seg

Ref: ID# 164330

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Thomas D. Boyle
Mathis & Donheiser
2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 3900
Dallas, Texas 75201
(w/o enclosures)