



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

February 3, 2011

Ms. Leslie O. Haby
Assistant City Attorney
City of San Antonio
P.O. Box 839966
San Antonio, Texas 78283

OR2011-01778

Dear Ms. Haby:

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# 408164 (COSA File No. 10-1877).

The City of San Antonio (the "city") received a request for eight categories of information pertaining to a specified development project. You state the city will release most of the requested information to the requestor. You claim the submitted 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

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code 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 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

¹We assume 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 those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

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). Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, lawyer representatives, and lawyers representing another party in a pending action concerning a matter of common interest therein. 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 pet.). Moreover, because the client may elect to waive the privilege at any time, a governmental body must explain 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 assert portions of the submitted information consist of communications between city attorneys and city employees. You individually identify all of the parties to the communications. You further state these communications were intended to be and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we find you have generally demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the e-mails and attachments you have marked. Thus, the city may generally withhold the e-mails and attachments you have marked under section 552.107.² However, we note one of the individual e-mails constitutes a communication with a party you have not demonstrated is privileged. Thus, to the extent this non-privileged e-mail, which we have marked, exists separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail chains, the city may not withhold it under section 552.107. However, a portion of this non-privileged e-mail may be subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code.³

Section 552.137 of the Government Code provides “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

²As our ruling for this information is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against its release.

³The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

e-mail address has affirmatively consented to its release or the e-mail address is specifically excluded by subsection (c). Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). Subsection 552.137(c)(1) provides subsection 552.137(a) does not apply to an e-mail address "provided to a governmental body by a person who has a contractual relationship with the governmental body or by the contractor's agent" and subsection 552.137(c)(2) provides subsection 552.137(a) does not apply to an e-mail address "provided to a governmental body by a vendor who seeks to contract with the governmental body or by the vendor's agent[.]" *Id.* § 552.137(c)(1), (2). We have marked an e-mail address that must be withheld under section 552.137, unless the owner consents to its disclosure.⁴ However, to the extent this personal e-mail address falls under the exceptions listed under subsection 552.137(c), the marked e-mail address may not be withheld under section 552.137.

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." *Id.* § 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, recommendations, and opinions 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 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 (Tex. 2000) (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking). 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).

This office also has concluded a preliminary draft of a document that is intended for public release in its final form necessarily represents the drafter's advice, opinion, and recommendation with regard to the form and content of the final document, so as to be

⁴Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009) is 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 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

excepted from disclosure under section 552.111. *See* Open Records Decision No. 559 at 2 (1990) (applying statutory predecessor). Section 552.111 protects factual information in the draft that also will be included in the final version of the document. *See id.* at 2-3. Thus, section 552.111 encompasses the entire contents, including comments, underlining, deletions, and proofreading marks, of a preliminary draft of a policymaking document that will be released to the public in its final form. *See id.* at 2.

You assert the remaining document you have marked is a draft that is excepted from disclosure under section 552.111. You state this document constitutes a draft of an agreement that, when finalized, will be released to the public. Based on your representation and our review, we find the city may withhold the remaining information you have marked under section 552.111.

In summary, the city may generally withhold the e-mails and attachments you have marked under section 552.107 of the Government Code. However, to the extent the non-privileged e-mail, which we have marked, exists separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail chains, the city may not withhold it under section 552.107 of the Government Code. In that event, to the extent the e-mail address we have marked is not excluded by subsection (c), the city must withhold it under section 552.137 of the Government Code unless the owner consents to its disclosure. The city may withhold the remaining information you have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

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,



Ana Carolina Vieira
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

ACV/eeg

Ref: ID# 408164

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)