



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

August 11, 2010

Mr. T. Aaron Dobbs
Assistant City Attorney
City of Sugar Land
P.O. Box 110
Sugar Land, Texas 77487-0110

OR2010-12178

Dear Mr. Dobbs:

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#390017.

The City of Sugar Land (the "city") received a request for four categories of information relating to the city's acquisition of assets and water rights from Fort Bend Water Control and Improvement District No. 1 ("WCID"). You state you have made available some of the responsive information to the requestor. You claim that the remaining requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107 and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

Initially, we note you have marked portions of the submitted information as not responsive to the instant request. The city need not release nonresponsive information in response to this request, and this ruling will not address that information.

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 claim a portion of the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code, which 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, 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 pet.). 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 the information you have marked consists of communications between city attorneys, city staff, and outside counsel for the city that were made for the purpose of providing legal advice to the city. You state these communications were made in confidence and their confidentiality has been maintained. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Therefore, the city may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107 of the Government Code.

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.” Gov’t Code § 552.111. This exception encompasses the deliberative process privilege. *See* Open 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 (1993), 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. The 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). Moreover, section 552.111 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).

Section 552.111 can also encompass communications between a governmental body and a third-party. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 631 at 2 (1995) (section 552.111 encompasses information created for governmental body by outside consultant acting at governmental body’s request and performing task that is within governmental body’s authority), 561 at 9 (1990) (section 552.111 encompasses communications with party with which governmental body has privity of interest or common deliberative process), 462 at 14 (1987) (section 552.111 applies to memoranda prepared by governmental body’s consultants). For section 552.111 to apply, the governmental body must identify the third party and explain the nature of its relationship with the governmental body. Section 552.111 is not applicable to a communication between the governmental body and a third party unless the governmental body establishes it has a privity of interest or common deliberative process with the third party. *See* ORD 561 at 9. We note that a governmental body does not have a privity of interest or common deliberative process with a private party with which the governmental body is engaged in contract negotiations. *See id.*

You state the remaining information you have marked reflects frank and open deliberations among city attorneys, outside counsel for the city, city council members, and WCID's Board of Directors regarding the city's acquisition of water rights from WCID. Upon review, we agree that some of the information at issue, which we have marked, reveals advice, opinions, and recommendations that pertain to policymaking. Accordingly, the city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, we note that a portion of the information at issue consists of a communication between the city and WCID's Board of Directors relating to negotiations between the city and WCID. Because the city and WCID were negotiating the city's acquisition of water rights from WCID, their interests were adverse. Thus, the city and WCID did not share a privity of interest or common deliberative process with regard to this information and it may not be withheld under section 552.111 of the Government Code. We further note that the remaining information you seek to withhold is factual in nature and is separable from the marked advice, opinion, and recommendations. Thus, because you do not demonstrate this remaining factual information is protected by the deliberative process privilege, it may not be withheld under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

We note the information at issue contains personal e-mail addresses. Section 552.137 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body," unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c).² *See* Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail addresses listed in the information at issue are not specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). As such, these e-mail addresses, which we have marked, must be withheld under section 552.137, unless the owners of the addresses have affirmatively consented to their release.³ *See id.* § 552.137(b).

In summary; 1) the city may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107 of the Government Code; 2) the city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code; and 3) the city must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners of the addresses have affirmatively consented to their release. The remaining requested information must be released.

²The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

³Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009) serves as a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold ten categories of information, including e-mail addresses of members of the public under section 552.137, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

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, toll free at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Vanessa Burgess', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Vanessa Burgess
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

VB/jb

Ref: ID#390017

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)