



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

September 8, 2004

Ms. YuShan Chang
Assistant City Attorney
City of Houston
P.O. Box 1562
Houston, Texas 77251-1562

OR2004-7646

Dear Ms. Chang:

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# 208187.

The City of Houston (the "city") received a request for information related to a reorganization of the jobs of civilian jailers, including records pertaining to a "reorganization committee." You indicate that there is not a "reorganization committee" and there are no documents responsive to the request for a proposal for "changes in employment practices." 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). You claim that the responsive information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, 552.108, and 552.111 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

¹Although you also raised section 552.1175 as an exception to disclosure, you did not submit to this office written comments stating the reasons why this section would allow the information to be withheld; we therefore assume that you no longer assert this exception. *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.

Initially, we note that the submitted information includes information that is subject to section 552.022. Section 552.022(a) enumerates categories of information that are public information and not excepted from required disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code unless they are expressly confidential under other law. The information that you submitted to us for review contains a completed report, which falls into one of the categories of information made expressly public by section 552.022. *See* Gov't Code § 522.022(a)(1). Section 552.022(a)(1) states that a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body is expressly public unless it is excepted under section 552.108 of the Government Code or is expressly confidential under other law. You claim that the information subject to section 552.022 is excepted from disclosure under section 552.111. Section 552.111 of the Government Code is a discretionary exception to disclosure that protects the governmental body's interests and is therefore not other law that makes information expressly confidential for purposes of section 552.022(a). *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 663 (1999) (governmental body may waive section 552.111), 473 (1987) (governmental body may waive section 552.111). Because information subject to release under section 552.022(a)(1) may be withheld as provided by sections 552.101 and 552.108, we will address your arguments regarding these sections for this information, as well as for the remaining submitted information.

Section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure an internal record of a law enforcement agency that is maintained for internal use in matters relating to law enforcement or prosecution if "release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution." *See City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320, 327 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet. h.) (section 552.108(b)(1) protects information which, if released, would permit private citizens to anticipate weaknesses in police department, avoid detection, jeopardize office safety, and generally undermine police efforts to effectuate state laws). Generally, a governmental body claiming section 552.108(b)(1) must reasonably explain, if the information does not supply the explanation on its face, how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.108(b)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). This office has on numerous occasions concluded that section 552.108 excepts from public disclosure information relating to the security or operation of a law enforcement agency. *See, e.g.,* Open Records Decision Nos. 531 (1989) (holding that section 552.108 excepts detailed guidelines regarding a police department's use of force policy), 508 (1988) (holding that release of dates of prison transfer could impair security), 413 (1984) (holding that section 552.108 excepts sketch showing security measures for execution). In this instance, you contend that the release of the information you have marked relating to "specifications, operating procedures, and location of security systems" as well as "other security information" of the jail would interfere with law enforcement by compromising security measures and could "place the lives of law enforcement at risk."

to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

Having reviewed your arguments and the submitted information, we agree that the release of the security information would interfere with law enforcement. Accordingly, the city may withhold the marked security information from disclosure under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code.³

We next address your claims regarding the information not subject to section 552.022. Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body has the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002).

First, a governmental body must demonstrate that the information constitutes or documents a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made “for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services” to the client governmental body. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). The privilege does not apply when an attorney or representative is involved in some capacity other than that of providing or facilitating professional legal services to the client governmental body. *In re Tex. Farmers Ins. Exch.*, 990 S.W.2d 337, 340 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1999, orig. proceeding) (attorney-client privilege does not apply if attorney acting in capacity other than that of attorney). Governmental attorneys often act in capacities other than that of professional legal counsel, such as administrators, investigators, or managers. Thus, the mere fact that a communication involves an attorney for the government does not demonstrate this element. Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1)(A), (B), (C), (D), (E). Thus, a governmental body must inform this office of the identities and capacities of the individuals to whom each communication at issue has been made. Lastly, the attorney-client privilege applies only to a *confidential* communication, *id.* 503(b)(1), meaning it was “not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client or those reasonably necessary for the transmission of the communication.” *Id.* 503(a)(5).

Whether a communication meets this definition depends on the *intent* of the parties involved at the time the information was communicated. *Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, no writ). Moreover, because the client may elect to waive the privilege at any time, a governmental body must explain that the confidentiality of a communication has been maintained. Section 552.107(1) generally excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege unless otherwise waived by the governmental body. *See Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein).

³As section 552.108 is dispositive, we do not address your remaining claims for this information.

You represent that the information submitted as Exhibit 3 consists of confidential communications exchanged between the city and its attorneys. Upon review of the information at issue, we conclude that some of it is protected by the attorney-client privilege, and thus may be withheld under section 552.107 of the Government Code. However, we find that you have failed to establish that the remaining information in Exhibit 3 constitutes or documents confidential communications made between parties subject to the privilege for the purpose of providing legal services to the city. Thus, we conclude that this information is not protected by the attorney-client privilege and may not be withheld on that basis. We have marked the information that the city may withhold under section 552.107.

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.” 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, and opinions 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 (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). Having reviewed the information in question, we agree that some of the information you seek to withhold pursuant to section 552.111 consists of advice, recommendations, and opinions reflecting the policymaking processes of the city. Therefore, we have marked the information that the city may withhold under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The remaining information, however, does not consist of advice, recommendations, and opinions reflecting the policymaking processes of the city, and therefore may not be withheld under section 552.111.

In summary, the city may withhold the security information that you have marked under section 552.108. We have marked the information that the city may withhold under sections 552.107 and 552.111 of the Government Code. The remaining 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 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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Cindy Nettles". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large initial "C" and "N".

Cindy Nettles
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CN/jh

Ref: ID# 208187
Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Jim Thompson, GySgt
Chief Executive Officer
African-American Legal Defense Group
P.O. Box 91212
Houston, Texas 77291-1212
(w/o enclosures)