



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

September 10, 2007

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

OR2007-11775

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# 288817.

The City of Houston (the "city") received two requests from the same requestor for several categories of information pertaining to the Housing and Community Development Department (the "department"). You state you will release some information to the requestor. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107, 552.111, and 552.117 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information, a portion of which consists of a representative sample.¹ We have also received and considered comments submitted by the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Initially, we note that you have not submitted the requested moving plan, relocation schedule, or organizational chart for our review. We therefore assume you have released such information to the extent that it existed when the department received the request. If

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.

you have not released any such records, you must do so at this time. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301(a), .302; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (if governmental body concludes that no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible).

Next, you inform us that some of the requested information, consisting of correspondence dealing with the department's layoff plan, was the subject of a previous request for information, in response to which this office issued Open Records Letter No. 2007-10842. Based on your representation, we conclude that, to the extent that information responsive to the current requests is identical to the information previously requested and ruled upon by this office, and the law, facts, and circumstances on which the prior ruling was based have not changed, the city may continue to rely on that ruling as a previous determination and withhold or release any such information in accordance with Open Records Letter No. 2007-10842. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (so long as law, facts, and circumstances on which prior ruling was based have not changed, first type of previous determination exists where requested information is precisely same information as was addressed in prior attorney general ruling, ruling is addressed to same governmental body, and ruling concludes that information is or is not excepted from disclosure). To the extent the submitted information is not identical, we will consider your arguments.

You assert that some of the submitted information is excepted under section 552.107 of the Government Code. Section 552.107(1) protects information 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 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 a capacity other than that of attorney). Because government attorneys often act in capacities other than that of professional legal counsel, including as administrators, investigators, or managers, 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. Finally, 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 the definition of a confidential communication 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 the information at issue consists of communications between city attorneys and a city department client. You argue that these confidential communications constitute legal advice and should be withheld. Upon review, we determine that the information we have marked consists of confidential attorney-client communications and may be withheld pursuant to section 552.107 of the Government Code. However, we determine that the city has failed to demonstrate that the remaining information constitutes attorney-client communications. Consequently, no portion of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.107 of the Government Code.

You assert that some of the remaining information 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.” *See Gov’t Code* § 552.111. Section 552.111 encompasses the deliberative process privilege. *See Open Records Decision No. 615 at 2* (1993). In *Open Records Decision No. 615*, 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. *See City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351, 364 (Tex. 2000); *see also Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin, 2001, no pet.). The purpose of section 552.111 is “to protect from public disclosure advice and opinions on policy matters and to encourage frank and open discussion within the agency in connection with its decision-making processes.” *Austin v. City of San Antonio*, 630 S.W.2d 391, 394 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1982, writ ref’d n.r.e.).

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. *See Open Records Decision No. 615 at 5-6*. 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). Further, a 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 559 at 2 (1990). 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).

You state that the information at issue consists of "drafts of memos and internal communications pertaining to layoffs resulting from the reorganization of the department, so that it may better provide affordable housing, emergency home repair to elderly and disabled citizens, and better serve the community by cutting administrative costs." You further inform us that this information constitutes "administrative and personnel matters of broad scope" that affect the department's policy mission. Upon review, we determine that you may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, the remaining information does not consist of advice, opinion, or recommendation for section 552.111 purposes. Accordingly, no portion of the remaining information may be withheld on this basis.

Section 552.117(a)(1) excepts from disclosure the current and former home addresses, telephone numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024. Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). *See also* Open Records Decision No. 670 (2001) (extending section 552.117(a)(1) exception to personal cellular telephone number and personal pager number of employee who elects to withhold home telephone number in accordance with section 552.024). However, information subject to section 552.117(a)(1) may not be withheld from disclosure if the current or former employee made the request for confidentiality under section 552.024 after the request for information at issue was received by the governmental body. Whether a particular piece of information is public must be determined at the time the request for it is made. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). In this case, you do not inform us nor provide documentation showing when the employee at issue elected confidentiality under section 552.024. Thus, if the employee at issue timely elected to keep his personal information confidential, you must withhold the marked personal cellular telephone number information under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city may not withhold this information under section 552.117(a)(1) if the employee at issue did not make a timely election.

In summary, the city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.107 of the Government Code. The city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. If the employee at issue timely elected confidentiality, the city must withhold the marked information under section 552.117 of the Government Code. The remaining 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); *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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Amy Shipp", written in a cursive style.

Amy L.S. Shipp
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

ALS/mcf

Ref: ID# 288817

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Darren Preacely
2214 Bagby, #3316
Houston, Texas 77002
(w/o enclosures)