



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

August 30, 2007

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

OR2007-11263

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# 287915.

The City of Houston (the "city") received a request for a copy of all documentation and information pertaining to and/or referencing a specified policy. You state that the city Planning and Development department will make a portion of the responsive information available to the requestor. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107, 552.111, and 552.137 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information within the attorney-client privilege. When asserting the attorney-client privilege under section 552.107, 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

¹We 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.

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).

You state that Exhibit 2 consists of internal communications between city attorneys and the Mayor’s office, Council Members’ offices, and the city Planning and Development Department regarding the policy at issue. You state that the information contains requests for legal advice, legal opinions, legal advice, and recommendations from city attorneys. We agree that most of this information was made for the purpose of rendering legal services to the city. We understand you to assert that these communications were intended to be confidential, and you do not indicate that the attorney-client privilege has been waived. Based on your representations and our review, we agree that most of Exhibit 2 is protected by the attorney-client privilege and may be withheld under section 552.107 of the Government Code.² However, one e-mail you wish to withhold, an e-mail which we have marked, is between two staff members at the Mayor’s Office and Planning and Development Department. We find that a portion of this e-mail, which we have marked, may be withheld under section 552.107. However, you have not established that the remainder of this e-mail consists of privileged attorney-client communications. Therefore, the city may not withhold the remainder of this e-mail under section 552.107 of the Government Code.

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against the disclosure of this information.

You claim that the remaining information in Exhibit 2 is excepted under section 552.111 of the Government Code. Section 552.111 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. In Open Records Decision No. 615 (1993), this office reexamined the predecessor to the section 552.111 exception 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), and held that section 552.111 excepts only those internal communications consisting of advice, recommendations, opinions, and other material reflecting the deliberative or policymaking processes of the governmental body. Open Records Decision No. 615 at 5-6.

An agency’s policymaking functions, however, 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. *Id.* Additionally, section 552.111 does not generally except from disclosure purely factual information that is severable from the opinion portions of internal memoranda. *See Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex. Atty. Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152, 160 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no writ); Open Records Decision No. 615 at 4-5.

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.

You state that the remaining information in Exhibit 2 consists of drafts of ordinances and attorney work product. Upon review, we find the city has failed to establish the information at issue is a draft of a policymaking document intended for public release in its final form. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information in Exhibit 2 under section 552.111 on that basis.

Section 552.111 also encompasses the attorney work product privilege found at rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. *See* TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5; *City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351, 360 (Tex. 2000); Open Records Decision No. 677 at 4-8 (2002). Rule 192.5 defines attorney work product as consisting of

- (1) material prepared or mental impressions developed in anticipation of litigation or for trial by or for a party or a party’s representatives, including the party’s attorneys, consultants, sureties, indemnitors, insurers, employees, or agents; or

(2) a communication made in anticipation of litigation or for trial between a party and the party's representatives or among a party's representatives, including the party's attorneys, consultants, sureties, indemnitors, insurers, employees or agents.

TEX.R.CIV.P. 192.5. A governmental body that seeks to withhold information on the basis of the attorney work product privilege under section 552.111 bears the burden of demonstrating that the information was created or developed for trial or in anticipation of litigation by or for a party or a party's representative. *See id.*; Open Records Decision No. 677 at 6-8. In order for this office to conclude that information was created or developed in anticipation of litigation, we must be satisfied that

(a) a reasonable person would have concluded from the totality of the circumstances surrounding the investigation that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue; and (b) the party resisting discovery believed in good faith that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue and [created or obtained the information] for the purpose of preparing for such litigation.

Nat'l Tank Co. v. Brotherton, 851 S.W.2d 193, 207 (Tex. 1993). A "substantial chance" of litigation does not mean a statistical probability, but rather "that litigation is more than merely an abstract possibility or unwarranted fear." *Id.* at 204; Open Records Decision No. 677 at 7.

You state that the remaining information in Exhibit 2 "contains information created by an attorney that reveals the attorney's opinions, recommendations, and mental impressions." Upon review, we find that you have not demonstrated that any of the information at issue was prepared by an attorney for trial or in anticipation of litigation. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information in Exhibit 2 under section 552.111 as attorney work product.

You claim that a portion of the information contained in Exhibit 3 is excepted from disclosure under section 552.137 of the Government Code. Section 552.137 provides:

(a) Except as otherwise provided by this section, an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body is confidential and not subject to disclosure under this chapter.

(b) Confidential information described by this section that relates to a member of the public may be disclosed if the member of the public affirmatively consents to its release.

(c) Subsection (a) does not apply to an e-mail address:

- (1) provided to a governmental body by a person who has a contractual relationship with the governmental body or by the contractor's agent;
 - (2) provided to a governmental body by a vendor who seeks to contract with the governmental body or by the vendor's agent;
 - (3) contained in a response to a request for bids or proposals, contained in a response to similar invitations soliciting offers or information relating to a potential contract, or provided to a governmental body in the course of negotiating the terms of a contract or potential contract; or
 - (4) provided to a governmental body on a letterhead, coversheet, printed document, or other document made available to the public.
- (d) Subsection (a) does not prevent a governmental body from disclosing an e-mail address for any reason to another governmental body or to a federal agency.

Gov't Code § 552.137. Under section 552.137, a governmental body must withhold the e-mail address of a member of the general public, unless the individual to whom the e-mail address belongs has affirmatively consented to its public disclosure. *See id.* § 552.137(b). The types of e-mail addresses listed in section 552.137(c) may not be withheld under section 552.137. Likewise, this section is not applicable to an institutional e-mail address, an Internet website address, or an e-mail address that a governmental entity maintains for one of its officials or employees. The e-mail addresses at issue does not appear to be of a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). You state that the individuals whose e-mail addresses are at issue have not affirmatively consented to the release of their e-mail addresses. Therefore, we agree that the city must withhold the e-mail addresses you have marked, and the additional e-mail address we have marked, under section 552.137 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city may withhold most of Exhibit 2, including the marked section 552.107 information in the e-mail we have marked, pursuant to section 552.107 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information contained in the e-mail we have marked. The city must withhold the marked e-mail addresses in Exhibit 3 pursuant to section 552.137 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.

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,



Jordan Johnson
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JJ/jb

Ref: ID# 287915

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Jessica Maloney
Brown & Carls, L.L.P.
106 East 6th Street, Suite 550
Austin, Texas 78701
(w/o enclosures)