



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

February 20, 2009

Mr. Jesús Toscano, Jr.
Administrative Assistant City Attorney
City of Dallas
1500 Marilla Street, Room 7BN
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2009-02253

Dear Mr. Toscano:

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# 335352.

The City of Dallas (the "city") received a request for "all emails, memos, and documents" related to a specified study conducted by the city. You state that you will provide some of the requested information to the requestor. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107, 552.111, and 552.136 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

¹Although you also raise Texas Rule of Evidence 503, the Texas Supreme Court has held that the Texas Rules of Evidence are other laws that make information confidential for the purposes of section 552.022 of the Government Code. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). The information for which you claim the attorney-client privilege is not encompassed by section 552.022, and thus, we do not address rule 503.

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.

Section 552.107 of the Government Code protects information that comes 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. *See* 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. *See* 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. *See 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. *See* 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. *See 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.

You claim that submitted Exhibit C and portions of submitted Exhibit B are confidential communications between the city attorney and city staff that were made in connection with the rendition of professional legal services and have remained confidential. Based on these arguments and our review of the information, we conclude that the city may withhold the information at issue, which we have marked, under section 552.107 of the Government Code.³

Section 552.111 of the Government Code 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.” This exception encompasses the deliberative process privilege. *See* Open

³As our ruling regarding the information at issue is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure.

Records Decision No. 615 at 2 (1993). The purpose of section 552.111 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, opinions, and other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the governmental body. See Open Records Decision No. 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 (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).

You claim the remaining information in Exhibit B consists of advice, recommendations, and opinions that reflect the policymaking processes of the city. Based on your representations and our review, we find the city may withhold some of the information at issue, which we have marked, under section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, the remaining information is either factual, or pertains to administrative or personnel issues that do not rise to the level of policymaking. Therefore, this information does not represent advice, recommendations, opinions, and other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the city and may not be withheld under this section.

You assert that the employee identification numbers you have marked in submitted Exhibit D are confidential under section 552.136(b) of the Government Code, which states that "[n]otwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential." Gov't Code § 552.136. You inform us that an employee's identification number is also used as an employee's credit union bank account number. Thus, we agree that this information is subject to section 552.136. Therefore, the city must withhold the information that you have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city may withhold the information we have marked under sections 552.107 and 552.111 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the identification numbers you have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information 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 information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php, or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General at (512) 475-2497.

Sincerely,



Matt Entsminger
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MRE/jb

Ref: ID# 335352

Enc. Submitted documents

cc: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)