



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

February 1, 2006

Mr. John Danner
Assistant City Attorney
City of San Antonio
P. O. Box 839966
San Antonio, Texas 78283

OR2006-01044

Dear Mr. Danner:

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# 241332.

The City of San Antonio (the "city") received two requests from the same requestor for information relating to an audit and investigation of the city's telecommunications providers. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.106, 552.111, 552.116, 552.131, and 552.139 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

Section 552.111 of the Government Code 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." Gov't Code § 552.117. In Open Records Decision No. 615 (1993), this

¹Although you also raise sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.104, 552.107, 552.117, 552.128, and 552.137 of the Government Code, you have not provided any arguments in support of these claims. Thus, the city has waived its claims under sections 552.104 and 552.107. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e) (governmental body must provide comments explaining why exceptions raised should apply to information requested); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions in general). Further, the city has not demonstrated that any of the submitted information is confidential for purposes of section 552.101, 552.102, 552.117, 552.128 or 552.137. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302.

²We 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.

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. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152, 160 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.). Section 552.111 does not, however, 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).

Having reviewed the submitted draft report, we agree it pertains to a policymaking matter. The city states the report will be made available to the requestor after its completion. Thus, we conclude the city may withhold the draft report under section 552.111.³

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, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, then the

³As section 552.111 is dispositive, we do not address your remaining claims.

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 Office of the Attorney General 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. 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,



Brian J. Rogers
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

BJR/krl

Ref: ID# 241332

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. John E. Foddrill, Sr.
P. O. Box 91035
San Antonio, Texas 78209
(w/o enclosures)