



OFFICE *of the* ATTORNEY GENERAL
GREG ABBOTT

May 15, 2003

Ms. Mary Kay Fischer
City Attorney
City of Killeen
P.O. Box 1329
Killeen, Texas 76540-1329

OR2003-3271

Dear Ms. Fischer:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 181052.

The City of Killeen (the "city") received a written request for all e-mail messages, written notes, or memoranda exchanged between the city manager, the city's mayor, and city council members regarding the evaluation of the city manager during the city council meeting on March 4, 2003. You have submitted to this office as responsive to the request one "Interoffice Memorandum," which you contend is excepted from required public disclosure pursuant to section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Section 552.111 of the Government Code excepts from required public disclosure interagency and intra-agency memoranda and letters, but only to the extent that they contain advice, opinion, or recommendation intended for use in the governmental entity's policymaking process. Open Records Decision No. 615 at 5 (1993). The purpose of this section is "to protect from public disclosure advice and opinions *on policy matters* and to encourage frank and open discussion within the agency in connection with its decision-making processes." *Austin v. City of San Antonio*, 630 S.W.2d 391, 394 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1982, writ ref'd n.r.e.) (emphasis added); *see also City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 969 S.W.2d 548 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1998), *aff'd*, 22 S.W.3d 351 (Tex. 2000). In Open Records Decision No. 615 at 5, this office held that

to come within the [section 552.111] exception, information must be related to the *policymaking* functions of the governmental body. An agency's policymaking functions do not encompass routine internal administrative and personnel matters [Emphasis in original.]

After reviewing the record you submitted to this office, we conclude that none of this information constitutes advice, opinion, or recommendation intended for use in the city's policymaking process. Rather, this record pertains to a personnel matter not protected from disclosure under section 552.111. Accordingly, we conclude that none of the information at issue is protected from public disclosure under section 552.111. Because you have raised no applicable exception to required public disclosure, we conclude that the city must release the submitted information in its entirety.

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 Dep't of Pub. 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,



Ronald J. Bounds
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

RJB/RWP/seg

Ref: ID# 181052

Enc: Submitted document

c: Ms. Lisa Soule
Killeen Daily Herald
P.O. Box 1300
Killeen, Texas 76540
(w/o enclosures)