



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 3, 2016

Ms. Patricia A. Rigney
City Attorney
City of Pharr
P.O. Box 1729
Pharr, Texas 78577

OR2016-24570

Dear Ms. Rigney:

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# 632945.

The City of Pharr (the "city") received a request for 1) records pertaining to a specified incident, 2) documents regarding safety requirements for contractors working with the city, 3) a specified contract between the city and a named third party, 4) specific requirements for personal protective equipment and other safety equipment called for in work performed by city contractors, and 5) specific requirements for personal protective equipment and other safety equipment in work performed by a specified third party on a specified date. You state the city has no information responsive to portions of the request.¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.107, 552.108 and 552.111 of the Government Code and privileged under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.² We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

¹The Act does not require a governmental body that receives a request for information to create information that did not exist when the request was received. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 563 at 8 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

²Although you do not raise section 552.108 of the Government Code in your brief, we understand you to raise this exception based on the substance of your arguments.

Initially, we note some of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides, in relevant part:

(a) [T]he following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

...

(3) information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of public or other funds by a governmental body[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(3). The submitted information includes information in an account, contract, or voucher relating to the receipt or expenditure of funds by the city that is subject to section 552.022(a)(3). This information, which we have indicated, must be released unless it is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* You seek to withhold the information subject to section 552.022(a)(3) under sections 552.103, 552.107, 552.108, and 552.111 of the Government Code. However, these sections are discretionary in nature and do not make information confidential under the Act. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 663 at 5 (1999) (governmental body may waive section 552.111), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 676 at 10-11 (2002) (attorney-client privilege under Gov't Code § 552.107(1) may be waived), 177 at 3 (1977) (statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.108 subject to waiver). Therefore, the information subject to section 552.022(a)(3) may not be withheld under section 552.103, section 552.107, section 552.108, or section 552.111 of the Government Code. We note you seek to withhold the information at issue under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. The Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Evidence are “other law” within the meaning of section 552.022. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). We will therefore consider your assertion of the attorney-client privilege under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence for the information subject to section 552.022(a)(3). Further, as section 552.136 of the Government Code makes information confidential under the Act, we will consider its applicability to the information at issue.³ We will also consider your arguments for the information not subject to section 552.022.

Texas Rule of Evidence 503(b)(1) provides as follows:

³The 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).

A client has a privilege to refuse to disclose and to prevent any other person from disclosing confidential communications made to facilitate the rendition of professional legal services to the client:

(A) between the client or the client's representative and the client's lawyer or the lawyer's representative;

(B) between the client's lawyer and the lawyer's representative;

(C) by the client, the client's representative, the client's lawyer, or the lawyer's representative to a lawyer representing another party in a pending action or that lawyer's representative, if the communications concern a matter of common interest in the pending action;

(D) between the client's representatives or between the client and the client's representative; or

(E) among lawyers and their representatives representing the same client.

TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). A communication is "confidential" if it is 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).

Thus, in order to withhold attorney-client privileged information from disclosure under rule 503, a governmental body must (1) show the document is a communication transmitted between privileged parties or reveals a confidential communication; (2) identify the parties involved in the communication; and (3) show the communication is confidential by explaining it was not intended to be disclosed to third persons and it was made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client. Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the information is privileged and confidential under rule 503, provided the client has not waived the privilege or the document does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in rule 503(d). *See Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, orig. proceeding).

You assert the information subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code must be withheld under rule 503. You inform us the information at issue consists of communications "made for the purpose of providing legal services to the [c]ity and to advise them regarding the incident made the basis of the request." You state the information at issue was intended to be confidential and that confidentiality has been maintained. However, we find the information at issue was shared with non-privileged parties. Accordingly, no portion of the information subject to section 552.022(a)(3) of the Government Code may be withheld under rule 503.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides, in relevant part:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

...

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). A governmental body that claims an exception to disclosure under section 552.103 has the burden of providing relevant facts and documentation sufficient to establish the applicability of this exception to the information that it seeks to withhold. To meet this burden, the governmental body must demonstrate that (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to the pending or anticipated litigation. *See Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, orig. proceeding); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). The governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a).

The question of whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). To demonstrate litigation is reasonably anticipated, the governmental body must provide this office "concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture." *Id.* We note the fact that a potential opposing party has hired an attorney who makes a request for information does not establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983). This office has concluded, when a governmental body receives a notice of claim letter, it can meet its burden of showing that litigation is reasonably anticipated by representing the notice of claim letter is in compliance with the requirements of the Texas Tort Claims Act (the "TTCA"), Civil Practice and Remedies Code chapter 101, or an applicable municipal ordinance. Open Records Decision No. 638 (1996).

You state, and provide documentation demonstrating, the request for information includes a notice of claim letter. You state the notice of claim letter meets the requirements of the TTCA. Thus, we find the city reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the request for information. You assert, and we agree, the submitted information is related to the

anticipated litigation for purposes of section 552.103(a). Therefore, section the city may generally withhold the information not subject to section 552.022(a)(3) of the Government Code under section 552.103(a) of the Government Code.

However, the information at issue involves alleged criminal activity. Information normally found on the front page of an offense or incident report is generally considered public. *Houston Chronicle Publ'g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976); *see* Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976). This office has stated basic information about a crime may not be withheld under section 552.103 even if it is related to the litigation. Open Records Decision No. 362 (1983). Thus, we find the basic offense information from the incident report may not be withheld on the basis of section 552.103. Therefore, with the exception of basic information, which the city must release, the city may withhold the information not subject to section 552.022 under section 552.103(a) of the Government Code.⁴

We note once the information has been obtained by all parties to the anticipated litigation, through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. Open Records Decision No. 349 at 2 (1982). We also note the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends when the litigation is concluded. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 at 2 (1982); Open Records Decision Nos. 350 at 3 (1982), 349 at 2.

You claim section 552.107 of the Government Code for the remaining information that is not subject to section 552.022. Section 552.107(1) protects information that comes within the attorney-client privilege. The elements of the privilege under section 552.107 are the same as those discussed for rule 503. 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* ORD 676 at 6-7. 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).

Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate the information at issue constitutes privileged communications made for the rendition of professional legal services. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the remaining information that is not subject to section 552.022 under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

⁴As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information, except to note that basic information may not be withheld from public disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.108(c); Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976).

You assert section 552.111 of the Government Code for the remaining information that is not subject to section 552.022. Section 552.111 excepts from disclosure “[a]n 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, writ ref’d n.r.e.); 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* 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). 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). Additionally, section 552.111 does not generally except from disclosure purely factual information that is severable from the opinion portions of internal memoranda. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.); ORD 615 at 4-5. 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).

You state the information at issue consists of “communications consisting of advice, opinion, and recommendations on handling the incident in question.” As previously stated, the deliberative process privilege only excepts communications pertaining to administrative and personnel matters of a broad scope that affect a governmental body’s policy mission. *See* ORD 631 at 3. Upon review, we find the information at issue does not constitute advice, opinions, recommendations, or other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the city, and the basic information is purely factual in nature. Therefore, you have failed to demonstrate the deliberative process privilege applies to the information at issue. Accordingly, you may not withhold the remaining information that is not subject to section 552.022 under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides, “Notwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], 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(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). This office has determined insurance policy numbers are access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. *See* Open Records Decision No. 684 at 9 (2009). Accordingly, the city must withhold the insurance policy numbers we marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, with the exception of basic information, which must be released, the city may withhold the information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code under section 552.103 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the insurance policy numbers we 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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, 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 may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Ian Lancaster
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

IML/akg

Ref: ID# 632945

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)