



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

May 21, 2009

Ms. Pauline E. Higgins  
Senior Vice President & General Counsel  
Metropolitan Transit Authority  
P.O. Box 61429  
Houston, Texas 77208-1429

OR2009-06958

Dear Ms. Higgins:

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# 343893 (MTA No. 2009-0101).

The Metropolitan Transit Authority of Harris County ("METRO") received a request for eleven categories of information pertaining to METRO bus and rail operations. You state you have made available information responsive to categories one through six of the request. You state you do not have information responsive to categories seven through ten.<sup>1</sup> You claim that the remaining information is exempted from disclosure under sections 552.111 and 552.116 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>The Act does not require a governmental body to release information that did not exist when a request for information was received or to prepare new information in response to a request. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266, 267-68 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dism'd); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

<sup>2</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.

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 *Texas Department of Public 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, 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 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). Moreover, section 552.111 does not protect facts and written observations of facts and events that are severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *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).

This office also has 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 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.

When determining if an interagency memorandum is excepted from disclosure under section 552.111, we must consider whether the agencies between which the memorandum is passed share a privity of interest or common deliberative process with regard to the policy matter at issue. *See* Open Records Decision No. 561 at 9 (1990).

You state that the submitted information consists of drafts and communications regarding a “DBE and Title VI Compliance Review.” However, we note that the information at issue was shared with the Federal Transit Administration (the “FTA”), which is charged with supporting locally planned and operated mass transit systems and operates in a regulatory posture regarding recipients of federal transit grants, loans and/or contracts awarded by the FTA. In this instance, you have not submitted any arguments explaining how METRO shares a privity of interest or common deliberative process with this outside party. Therefore, you have failed to establish the applicability of section 552.111 to the submitted information at issue. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.301(e)(1) (requiring the governmental body to explain the applicability of the raised exception). Thus, none of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

You also raise section 552.116 of the Government Code for the submitted information. Section 552.116 of the Government Code provides:

(a) An audit working paper of an audit of the state auditor or the auditor of a state agency, an institution of higher education as defined by Section 61.003, Education Code, a county, a municipality, a school district, or a joint board operating under Section 22.074, Transportation Code, including any audit relating to the criminal history background check of a public school employee, is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021. If information in an audit working paper is also maintained in another record, that other record is not excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 by this section.

(b) In this section:

(1) “Audit” means an audit authorized or required by a statute of this state or the United States, the charter or an ordinance of a municipality, an order of the commissioners court of a county, a resolution or other action of a board of trustees of a school district, including an audit by the district relating to the criminal history background check of a public school employee, or a resolution or other action of a joint board described by Subsection (a) and includes an investigation.

(2) “Audit working paper” includes all information, documentary or otherwise, prepared or maintained in conducting an audit or preparing an audit report, including:

(A) intra-agency and interagency communications; and

(B) drafts of the audit report or portions of those drafts.

Gov't Code § 552.116. You contend that the submitted information constitutes audit working papers prepared or maintained as part of an audit of METRO by the FTA. We note, however, that section 552.116 is intended to protect the auditor's interests. In this instance, the audit was conducted by the FTA. The information at issue is maintained by METRO, the auditee. As the auditee, METRO cannot assert section 552.116 in order to protect its own interest in withholding the information. Accordingly, section 552.116 is inapplicable and does not protect the submitted information from disclosure. As you raise no further arguments against disclosure, the submitted information must be released to the requestor.

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 [http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index\\_orl.php](http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php), or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General at (512) 475-2497.

Sincerely,



Christina Alvarado  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CA/rl

Ref: ID# 343892

Enc. Submitted documents

cc: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)