



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

May 4, 2005

Ms. Maleshia B. Farmer
Assistant City Attorney
City of Fort Worth
1000 Throckmorton Street
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

OR2005-03839

Dear Ms. Farmer:

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# 223365.

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received a request for information related "to expenditures for which reimbursement was requested or paid on behalf of" a named city councilmember and certain e-mail messages to and from this councilmember during a specified period of time. You state that the city will release the reimbursement records and most of the e-mail messages but claim that the remainder of the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.105, 552.107, 552.109, 552.111, 552.131, and 552.137 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

First, you characterize the e-mail communications in Exhibit C as being purely personal in nature. The Act is only applicable to "public information." See Gov't Code § 552.021. Section 552.002(a) defines public information as "information that is collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business: (1) by a governmental body; or (2) for a governmental body and the governmental

¹We note that you do not provide comments explaining why section 552.103 should apply to the information at issue. We therefore presume the city no longer intends to claim this exception to disclosure. See Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A).

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.

body owns the information or has a right of access to it.” Gov’t Code § 552.002(a). Information that is collected, assembled, or maintained by a third party may be subject to disclosure under the Act if it is maintained for a governmental body, the governmental body owns or has a right of access to the information, and the information pertains to the transaction of official business. *See* Open Records Decision No. 462 (1987).

You contend that the submitted personal e-mails in Exhibit C “were not collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business by or of the [city].” Based on your representations and our review of the e-mails at issue, we agree that most of these communications are not related to the transaction of official city business and therefore do not constitute “public information” of the city. Consequently, the city is not required to disclose most of the submitted e-mail communications in Exhibit C under the Act. *Cf.* Open Records Decision No. 635 (1995) (statutory predecessor not applicable to personal information unrelated to official business and created or maintained by state employee involving *de minimis* use of state resources). We have indicated the portions of Exhibit C that are subject to the Act and must be released unless an exception to disclosure under the Act applies.

You also claim that Exhibit C is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 and 552.109 of the Government Code. We therefore address your claims under these sections with respect to the information in Exhibit C that is subject to the Act. Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. This section encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. Section 552.109 excepts from public disclosure “[p]rivate correspondence or communications of an elected office holder relating to matters the disclosure of which would constitute an invasion of privacy[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.109. This office has held that the test to be applied to information under section 552.109 is the same as the test formulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation v. Texas Industrial Accident Board*, 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976), *cert. denied*, 430 U.S. 931 (1977), for information claimed to be protected under the doctrine of common-law privacy as incorporated by section 552.101. We will therefore consider your claims regarding common-law privacy under section 552.101 together with your claim under section 552.109.

In *Industrial Foundation*, the Texas Supreme Court held that information is protected by common-law privacy if it: (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person; and (2) is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Id.* at 685. The type of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. 540 S.W.2d at 683. Having reviewed your arguments and the submitted information, we find that none of the information at issue is protected by common-law privacy. Therefore, none of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy or under section 552.109.

We next address your claim under Section 552.105 of the Government Code with respect to the information submitted as Exhibit D. This section excepts from disclosure information relating to:

- (1) the location of real or personal property for a public purpose prior to public announcement of the project; or
- (2) appraisals or purchase price of real or personal property for a public purpose prior to the formal award of contracts for the property.

Gov't Code § 552.105. Section 552.105 is designed to protect a governmental body's planning and negotiating position with regard to particular transactions. Open Records Decision Nos. 564 (1990), 357 (1982), 222 (1979). Information excepted under section 552.105 that pertains to such negotiations may be excepted so long as the transaction is not complete. Open Records Decision Nos. 310 (1982), 265 (1981). A governmental body may withhold information "which, if released, would impair or tend to impair [its] 'planning and negotiating position in regard to particular transactions.'" Open Records Decision No. 357 at 3 (1982) (quoting Open Records Decision No. 222 (1979)). When a governmental body has made a good faith determination that the release of information would damage its negotiating position with respect to a real estate transaction, the attorney general will accept that determination unless the records or other information show the contrary as a matter of law. Open Records Decision No. 564 (1990).

You represent to us that the information in Exhibit D "is directly related to the location or price of several pieces of property that the City is considering purchasing for public use." You claim that this information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.105 because its release will harm the city's "negotiating position with respect to the acquisition of the property." Based on your representations and our review, we find that Exhibit D is excepted from disclosure under section 552.105 of the Government Code.³

Next, you claim that the information submitted as Exhibit E is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code. This section 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

³Because we reach this conclusion based on section 552.105, we need not address your arguments regarding the applicability of section 552.131 to Exhibit D.

professional legal services to the client governmental body. *In re Texas 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). Having considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted information, we agree that the information in Exhibit E reflects privileged attorney-client communications and may be withheld under section 552.107(1).⁴

We next address your claim that the information submitted as Exhibit F is excepted from public disclosure under section 552.111 of the Government Code. This section 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, 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. Texas 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

⁴Because we reach this conclusion based on section 552.107, we need not address your arguments regarding the applicability of sections 552.105, 552.111, and 552.131 to Exhibit E.

opinion portions of internal memoranda. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 37 S.W.3d at 160; ORD 615 at 4-5.

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 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. Having considered the city's arguments and representations and having reviewed the information at issue, we agree that some of the information in Exhibit F, which we have marked, may be withheld under section 552.111.

Lastly, we address your claim that some of the e-mail addresses contained in the submitted documents are subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code. This section 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 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 at issue do not appear to be of a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). We have marked the e-mail addresses in Exhibits F and G that must be withheld under section 552.137 unless their owners have affirmatively consented to their release. *See* Gov't Code § 552.137(b).

In summary: (1) with the exception of the information we have indicated is subject to the Act, the city is not required to disclose the submitted e-mail communications in Exhibit C; (2) Exhibit D may be withheld pursuant to section 552.105 of the Government Code; (3) Exhibit E may be withheld under section 552.107 of the Government Code; (4) the information we have marked in Exhibit F may be withheld in accordance with section 552.111 of the Government Code; (5) the e-mail addresses we have marked in Exhibits F and G must be withheld pursuant to section 552.137 of the Government Code unless their owners have affirmatively consented to their release; and (6) 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, 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); *Tex. 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,



Robert B. Rapfogel
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

RBR/krl

Ref: ID# 223365

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Shea Ross
Bowers & Searcy, P.C.
1320 South University Drive, Suite 825
Fort Worth, Texas 76107-5763
(w/o enclosures)