



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

March 7, 2008

Mr. Alan P. Petrov
City of West University Place
Johnson, Radcliffe, Petrov & Bobbitt, P.L.L.C.
1001 McKinney, Suite 1000
Houston, Texas 77002-6424

OR2008-03150

Dear Mr. Petrov:

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# 304185.

The City of West University Place (the "city") received two requests for all written communications, including e-mails, and all transcribed, sound, or video recordings regarding the city secretary during a specified period. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, 552.111, and 552.137 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information. We have also considered comments submitted by one of the requestors. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (providing that interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Initially, you state, and provide documentation showing, that the city sought clarification from both of the requestors. *See id.* § 552.222(b) (stating that if information requested is unclear to governmental body or if large amount of information has been requested, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify or narrow request, but may not inquire into purpose for which information will be used). You inform us that one of the requestors responded, but the city has not received a response from the other requestor. We note that a governmental body has a duty to make a good faith effort to relate a request for information to information that the governmental body holds. Open Records Decision No. 561 (1990). In this case, as you have submitted responsive information for our review and raised

exceptions to disclosure for these documents, we consider the city to have made a good faith effort to identify information that is responsive to the second request, and we will address the applicability of the claimed exceptions to the submitted information.

We next note that you contend that much of the submitted information is not subject to the Act. The Act is applicable to "public information," as defined by section 552.002 of the Government Code. Section 552.002 provides that "public information" consists of:

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 body owns the information or has a right of access to it.

Gov't Code § 552.002(a)(1)-(2). Thus, virtually all of the information that is in a governmental body's physical possession constitutes public information and thus is subject to the Act. *Id.* § 552.002(a)(1); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 549 at 4 (1990), 514 at 1-2 (1988). The Act also is applicable to information that a governmental body does not physically possess, if the information is collected, assembled, or maintained for the governmental body and the governmental body owns the information or has a right of access to it. Gov't Code § 552.002(a)(2); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 518 at 2-3 (1989), 462 at 4 (1987). The city states that the information at issue consists of communications between and among city employees and city attorneys. This information, which is held by the city, clearly consists of "information collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business by [the city]." Gov't Code § 552.002(a)(1). Thus, the submitted information is public information for the purposes of section 552.002 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This section encompasses the common-law right of privacy, which protects information that is 1) highly intimate or embarrassing, such that its release would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and 2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976). The types 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. *Id.* at 683. You claim that Exhibit D contains information protected by common-law privacy. Upon review, we determine that none of the information at issue is protected by common-law privacy. Accordingly, the city may not withhold Exhibit D under section 552.101 of the Government Code on this basis.

Next, you claim that Exhibit E is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code. Section 552.103 provides in part:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). The governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents sufficient to establish the applicability of section 552.103 to the information that it seeks to withhold. To meet this burden, the governmental body must demonstrate: (1) that litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date of its receipt of the request for information and (2) that the information at issue is related to that litigation. See *University of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, no pet.); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); see also Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). Both elements of the test must be met in order for information to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

To establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office "concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture." Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *Id.* Concrete evidence to support a claim that litigation is reasonably anticipated may include, for example, the governmental body's receipt of a letter containing a specific threat to sue the governmental body from an attorney for a potential opposing party. Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); see ORD 518 at 5 (litigation must be "realistically contemplated"). On the other hand, this office has determined that if an individual publicly threatens to bring suit against a governmental body, but does not actually take objective steps toward filing suit, litigation is not reasonably anticipated. See Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982). Further, the fact that a potential opposing party has hired an attorney who makes a request for information does not establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated. Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).

Upon review, we conclude that you have failed to demonstrate that any party has taken any concrete steps toward the initiation of litigation involving the city. *See* ORD 331. Thus, you have not established that the city reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the requests for information. Accordingly, the city may not withhold Exhibit E under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

You assert that Exhibit F, and the same information appearing in other exhibits, is excepted under section 552.107 of the Government Code. Section 552.107(1) 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 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). 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). 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.*, 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 the information at issue reveals communications between the city attorney, outside counsel, and city employees and officials. We understand that these communications

were not intended to be disclosed to persons other than those to whom the communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services. Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we conclude that section 552.107 is applicable to this information. Thus, the city may withhold the information in Exhibit F, and the same information where it appears in other exhibits, under section 552.107 of the Government Code.

Next, we address your argument under section 552.111 of the Government Code, which excepts from public 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. Section 552.111 encompasses the deliberative process privilege. See Open Records Decision No. 615 at 2 (1993). The purpose of this exception 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, 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, and opinions that reflect 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 also *City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351, 364 (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). Furthermore, section 552.111 of the Government Code 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).

You state that the information in Exhibits G and H should be withheld under section 552.111 because it "would be considered inter and/or intra agency memoranda" and it includes "draft documents that have not been released in final form to the public that involve the [c]ity's policy matters[.]" We find that exhibits G and H pertain to personnel matters that do not rise to the level of policy making. We therefore conclude that the city may not withhold any of

the information in Exhibits G and H on the basis of the deliberative process privilege under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

We note, however, that portions of the submitted information may be excepted from disclosure under section 552.1175 of the Government Code.¹ Section 552.1175 provides in part as follows:

(b) Information that relates to the home address, home telephone number, or social security number of [a peace officer as defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure], or that reveals whether the individual has family members is confidential and may not be disclosed to the public under this chapter if the individual to whom the information relates:

- (1) chooses to restrict public access to the information; and
- (2) notifies the governmental body of the individual's choice on a form provided by the governmental body, accompanied by evidence of the individual's status.

Gov't Code § 552.1175(a), (b). The city must withhold the personal information we have marked under section 552.1175 to the extent that the information relates to a currently licensed peace officer who elects to restrict access to this information in accordance with section 552.1175(b). If the city does not receive the appropriate election, the information we have marked regarding the peace officer must be released.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code states that "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 [the Act]," unless the owner of the e-mail address has affirmatively consented to its public disclosure. Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(b). The types of e-mail addresses listed in section 552.137(c) may not be withheld under this exception. *See id.* § 552.137(c). Likewise, section 552.137 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 are not of a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). The city must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners have affirmatively consented to their disclosure.

In summary, the city may withhold the information in Exhibit F, and the same information where it appears in other exhibits, under section 552.107 of the Government Code. The city

¹The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception like section 552.1175 of the Government Code on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

must withhold the personal information we have marked under section 552.1175 of the Government Code to the extent that the information relates to a currently licensed peace officer who elects to restrict access to this information in accordance with section 552.1175 of the Government Code. If the city does not receive the appropriate election, this information must be released. The city must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners have affirmatively consented to their disclosure. The remaining submitted information must be released to the requestors.

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 file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, 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 challenge 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,



Benjamin A. Diener
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

BAD/jb

Ref: ID# 304185

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Michael Reed
News Editor
Examiner Newspaper Group
4635 Southwest Freeway, Suite 325
Houston, Texas 77027
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Christie Tollett
KHOU-TV
1945 Allen Parkway
Houston, Texas 77019
(w/o enclosures)