



**ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS**  
**GREG ABBOTT**

July 5, 2006

Ms. Sharon Alexander  
Associate General Counsel  
Texas Department of Transportation  
125 East 11<sup>th</sup> Street  
Austin, Texas 78701-2483

OR2006-07064

Dear Ms. Alexander:

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# 253249.

The Texas Department of Transportation (the "department") received a request for copies of the following information:

- 1) The entire stakeholders survey and results for 281 done by HNTB and unveiled at the public meetings March 29 & 30 INCLUDING but not limited to who participated in the stakeholder meetings, who, in general terms, completed the survey, and the complete summary presented at the TxDOT public meetings[;]
- 2) Any feasibility study for toll lanes on I-10[;]
- 3) Any investment grade traffic and revenue studies for ANY toll projects in Bexar County or ANY surrounding county that falls within the San Antonio District for TxDOT[;]
- 4) Most current feasibility studies for 281/1604, Wurzbach Pkwy., I-35, Bandera Rd.

You state that some of the requested information has been released to the requestor. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>1</sup> We have also considered comments submitted by the requestor. See Gov't Code § 552.304 (providing that interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

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 § 552.111. 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, no writ); Open Records Decision No. 538 at 1-2 (1990).

In Open Records Decision No. 615 (1993), this office re-examined the statutory predecessor to section 552.111 in light of the decision in *Tex. Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ). We determined that section 552.111 excepts from disclosure only those internal communications that consist of advice, recommendations, and opinions that reflect the policymaking processes of the governmental body. See Open Records Decision No. 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. The Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351 (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). Furthermore, section 552.111 does not protect facts and written observations of facts and events that are severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. See Open Records Decision No. 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).

This office has also concluded that a preliminary draft of a document that is intended for public release in its final form necessarily represents the drafter's advice, opinion, and

---

<sup>1</sup>We 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.

recommendation with regard to the form and content of the final document, so as to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.111. *See* Open Records Decision No. 559 at 2 (1990) (applying statutory predecessor). Section 552.111 protects factual information in the draft that also will be included in the final version of the document. *See id.* at 2-3. Thus, section 552.111 encompasses the entire contents, including comments, underlining, deletions, and proofreading marks, of a preliminary draft of a policymaking document that will be released to the public in its final form. *See id.* at 2.

Further, section 552.111 can encompass communications between a governmental body and a third party consultant. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 631 at 2 (section 552.111 encompasses information created for governmental body by outside consultant acting at governmental body's request and performing task that is within governmental body's authority), 561 at 9 (1990) (section 552.111 encompasses communications with party with which governmental body has privity of interest or common deliberative process), 462 at 14 (1987) (section 552.111 applies to memoranda prepared by governmental body's consultants). 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* Open Records Decision No. 561 at 9.

You assert that the information at issue consists of intraagency communication of internal pre-decisional deliberations regarding agency policy. However, we note that the stakeholder survey and meeting attendance sheets were shared with outside parties. In this instance, you have not demonstrated that the department shares a privity of interest or common deliberative process with these outside parties. You have also failed to demonstrate that these documents constitute internal communications that consist of advice, recommendations, and opinions that reflect the policymaking processes of the department. Further, although you inform us that the feasibility study documents are "drafts," you have not informed us that the studies will be released to the public in their final form. Therefore, we find that the department has failed to establish the applicability of section 552.111 to the documents at issue. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1) (requiring governmental body to explain the applicability of the raised exception). Accordingly, none of the information at issue may be withheld under section 552.111.

We note, however, that the submitted information contains e-mail addresses that are excepted from disclosure under section 552.137 of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> Section 552.137 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

---

<sup>2</sup>This office will raise mandatory exceptions to disclosure on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

subsection (c). *See* Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). Section 552.137 does not apply to a government employee's work e-mail address because such an address is not that of the employee as a "member of the public" but is instead the address of the individual as a government employee. The e-mail addresses we have marked in the submitted information are not a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). Therefore, in accordance with section 552.137, the department must withhold the marked e-mail addresses unless the department receives consent to release them.

Finally, we note that some of the submitted information includes notice of copyright protection. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). A governmental body must allow inspection of materials that are subject to copyright protection unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.* If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit. *See* Open Records Decision No. 550 (1990). Accordingly, in releasing the information at issue the department must release copyrighted information only in accordance with copyright law.

In summary, the department must withhold the email addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code unless the department receives consent to release them. The remaining information must be released, but any information protected by copyright must be released in accordance with copyright law.

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 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,



Shelli Egger  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

SE/dh

Ref: ID# 253249

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Terri Hall  
San Antonio Toll Party  
18160 US Highway 281 North, Suite 108-251  
San Antonio, Texas 78232  
(w/o enclosures)