



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

April 11, 2008

Mr. Hyattye O. Simmons  
General Counsel  
Dallas Area Rapid Transit  
P.O. Box 660163  
Dallas, Texas 75266-0163

OR2008-04887

Dear Mr. Simmons:

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# 307168.

Dallas Area Rapid Transit ("DART") received a request for the following information: 1) all conflicts of interests disclosures from members of DART's board of directors and executive staff filed within the past three years; 2) all documents concerning conflicts of interests rules, disclosure of conflicts policies, and ethics rules for board members and executive staff from a specified time period; and 3) expense reports for each board member and two specified individuals from a specified time period. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, and 552.117 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, you indicate that DART sought clarification for a portion of the request from the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 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 DART has not received a response from the 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 DART to have

made a good faith effort to identify information that is responsive to the request, and we will address the applicability of the claimed exceptions to the submitted information.

Next, we note that you have not submitted the requested expense reports. To the extent that this or any additional responsive information exists and was not submitted for our review, we assume it has been released. If not, you must do so at this time. *See* Gov't Code § 552.006, .301, .302; *see* Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (noting that if governmental body concludes that no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code 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, which protects information that (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. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (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. In addition, this office has found that personal financial information that relates only to an individual ordinarily satisfies the first element of the common-law privacy test, but the public has a legitimate interest in the essential facts about a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 545 at 4 (1990) (attorney general has found kinds of financial information not excepted from public disclosure by common-law privacy to generally be those regarding receipt of governmental funds or debts owed to governmental entities), 523 at 4 (1989) (noting distinction under common-law privacy between confidential background financial information furnished to public body about individual and basic facts regarding particular financial transaction between individual and public body), 373 at 4 (1983) (determination of whether public's interest in obtaining personal financial information is sufficient to justify its disclosure must be made on case-by-case basis).

In this instance, we find that there is a legitimate public interest in the financial information at issue. The submitted statements of Financial Affiliation and Interest and corresponding affidavit are completed by a limited number of DART employees who make significant decisions regarding DART. These statements could provide information about potential conflicts of interest between a decision-maker's personal financial investments and the interests of DART. *See* Attorney General Opinion H-15 (1973) ("the public does have a legitimate interest in the current financial condition and recent financial history of those of its servants who are in positions of authority where the temptation to improperly exercise public discretion for private gain may coincide with the opportunity to do so") (emphasis in original); *cf.* H-1070 (1977) (high-ranking city officials' financial disclosure statements not *per se* protected by common-law privacy). Accordingly, we conclude that DART may not

withhold any portion of the information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

You claim that the information in Exhibit C is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code. Section 552.107 protects information coming 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 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)-(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 the information in Exhibit C consists of communications between DART attorneys and clients made for the purpose of rendering professional legal advice. You state that these communications were intended to be confidential, and that confidentiality has been maintained. Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we agree that Exhibit C is protected by the attorney-client privilege. We therefore conclude that DART may withhold Exhibit C under section 552.107 of the Government Code.

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code exempts from disclosure the home address, home telephone number, social security number, and family member information of a current or former official or employee of a governmental body who requests that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. Whether a particular piece of information is protected by section 552.117 must be determined at the time the request for it is made. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). If the employees at issue made requests for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for information was made, DART must withhold the information we have marked in Exhibit D pursuant to section 552.117(a)(1). If the employees at issue did not make timely requests for confidentiality, the information at issue must be released.

In summary, DART may withhold Exhibit C pursuant to section 552.107 of the Government Code. If the employees at issue made timely requests for confidentiality, DART must withhold the information we have marked in Exhibit D pursuant to section 552.117(a)(1) 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 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,



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

ALS/mcf

Ref: ID# 307168

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Michael Lindenberger  
Transportation Writer  
The Dallas Morning News  
508 Young Street  
Dallas, Texas 75202  
(w/o enclosures)