



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

September 10, 2012

Mr. Warren M. S. Ernst
Chief of the General Counsel Division
City of Dallas
1500 Marilla Street, Room 7DN
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2012-14292

Dear Mr. Ernst:

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# 464403.

The City of Dallas (the "city") received a request for e-mails, memos, or correspondence sent or received by five specified individuals in the years 2010, 2011, or 2012, that contain certain words. You state you will release some of the requested information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code, and privileged under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.¹ We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

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

¹We note the proper exception to raise when asserting the attorney-client privilege for information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code is section 552.107 of the Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 1 (2002).

²We 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.

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 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)(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. *Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, orig. proceeding). 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 Exhibit B consists of confidential communications made in furtherance of professional legal services rendered to the city. You state these communications contain legal advice and opinions and were exchanged between attorneys for the city and city staff. You state these communications were intended to be confidential and that the 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 in Exhibit B. Accordingly, the city may withhold the information in Exhibit B under section 552.107(1) 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

³As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of some of this information.

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); *see also* 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 only those internal communications that consist of advice, opinions, recommendations and other material reflecting 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. *See 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). Further, 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 has also concluded that 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 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 state the information in Exhibit C contains draft documents. You state this information contains the advice, opinions, and recommendations of the drafters. Further, you state the final form of these draft documents were released to the public. Based on your representations and our review of the information, we conclude the city may withhold the information we have marked in Exhibit C under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

However, we find you have not demonstrated the remaining information in Exhibit C reveals advice, recommendations, or opinions. Consequently, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information in Exhibit C under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

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 office has repeatedly held that the transfer of confidential information between governmental agencies does not destroy the confidentiality of that information. Attorney General Opinions H-917 (1976), H-836 (1974), Open Records Decision Nos. 561 (1990), 414 (1984), 388 (1983), 272 (1981), 183 (1978). These opinions recognize the need to maintain an unrestricted flow of information between state agencies. In Open Records Decision No. 561, we considered whether the same rule applied regarding information deemed confidential by a federal agency. In that decision, we noted the general rule that section 552 of title 5 of the United States Code, the federal Freedom of Information Act (“FOIA”), applies only to federal agencies and does not apply to records held by state agencies. ORD 561 at 6. Further, we stated that information is not confidential when in the hands of a Texas agency simply because the same information is confidential in the hands of a federal agency. *Id.* However, in the interests of comity between state and federal authorities and to ensure the flow of information from federal agencies to Texas governmental bodies, we concluded that: “when information in the possession of a federal agency is ‘deemed confidential’ by federal law, such confidentiality is not destroyed by the sharing of the information with a governmental body in Texas. In such an instance, [section 552.101] requires a local government to respect the confidentiality imposed on the information by federal law.” *Id.* at 7.

You assert that the United States Army Corps of Engineers (the “Corps”) considers the information you have marked in Exhibit D to be confidential under the personal privacy provisions found in sections 552(b)(6) and 552(b)(7)(c) of title 5 of the United States Code. *See* 5 U.S.C. § 552(b)(6), (7)(c). However, upon review, we find the e-mails you seek to withhold on this basis appear on their face to be records of the city, not the Corps. As discussed above, information is not confidential under the Act simply because the same information would be protected from disclosure in the hands of a federal agency. *See* ORD 561 at 6. We therefore conclude Exhibit D does not consist of confidential records of a federal agency transferred to the city, but rather consists of records of the city. Thus, the city may not withhold the any of the information in Exhibit D based on federal law.

In summary, the city may withhold the information in Exhibit B under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code and the information we have marked in Exhibit C under section 552.111 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, toll free at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Kathryn R. Mattingly". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, looping "K" and "M".

Kathryn R. Mattingly
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KRM/dls

Ref: ID# 464403

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)