



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

June 15, 2007

Mr. Charles K. Eldred
Assistant City Attorney
For the City of Jonestown
Knight & Partners
223 West Anderson Lane, Suite A-105
Austin, Texas 78752

OR2007-07648

Dear Mr. Eldred:

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# 281177.

The City of Jonestown (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a proposed development. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107 and 552.111 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted 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

¹Although you initially raised section 552.101 of the Government Code, you have not submitted arguments explaining how this exception applies to the submitted information. Therefore, we presume that you have withdrawn this exception. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301, 552.302.

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.

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, lawyer representatives, and a lawyer representing another party in a pending action and concerning a matter of common interest therein. *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. *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. 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 explain that the information in Exhibit B consists of confidential attorney-client communications between city attorneys and city employees made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services. Moreover, you state that these communications were not intended to be disclosed to third parties, and we understand this to mean that the confidentiality of the communications has been maintained. Based on your representations and our review of the submitted records, we agree that some of this information consists of confidential attorney-client communications. However, we conclude you have not established that the remaining information at issue consists of privileged attorney-client communications. *But see* TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1)(C) (client has privilege to refuse to disclose and to prevent any other person from disclosing confidential communications made for purpose of facilitating rendition of professional legal services to lawyer or representative of lawyer representing another party in pending action and *concerning a matter of common*

interest therein) (emphasis added); TEX. R. DISCIPLINARY CONDUCT 1.05(c)(1) (lawyer may reveal confidential information when lawyer has been expressly authorized to do so in order to carry out representation). Therefore, with the exception of the information we have marked for release, the city may withhold Exhibit B under section 552.107.

Next, you assert that Exhibits C and D are excepted under section 552.111 of the Government Code. Section 552.111 excepts from public 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. The purpose of this exception 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 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. The Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351 (Tex. 2000) (stating that Gov’t Code § 552.111 is not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking). 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. If, however, the 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 may also 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 policymaking 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. Finally, section 552.111 does not apply unless the entities between which the information is passed are shown to share a privity of interest or common deliberative process with regard to the policy matter at issue. Open Records Decision No. 561 at 9 (1990).

We understand you to assert that Exhibit C and a part of Exhibit D consist of internal communications between city employees containing advice, recommendations, and opinions pertaining to a proposed development. However, we note that some of the information in Exhibits C and D was shared with third parties. Information shared with a third party may not be withheld under section 552.111 unless the city explains how it has a privity of interest or common deliberative process with the third party. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 631, 561, 462. As you have not explained how the city shares a privity of interest or common deliberative process with the third parties at issue, the information we have marked in Exhibits C and D may not be withheld under section 552.111. You assert that the remaining information in Exhibit D consists of drafts of a proposed development agreement. We understand you to represent that the city will release the draft agreement in its final form. Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we agree that the city may withhold the information in Exhibits C and D, except as we have marked for release, under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Finally, we note that submitted information contains e-mail addresses that are subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code.³ This section 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). *See id.* § 552.137(a)-(c). We find that the e-mail addresses at issue are not of the type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). Therefore, unless the individuals at issue consented to the release of their e-mail addresses, the city must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked in accordance with section 552.137 of the Government Code.

In summary, with the exception of the information we have marked for release, the city may withhold Exhibit B under section 552.107 of the Government Code. The city may withhold the information in Exhibits C and D, except as we have marked for release, under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The e-mail addresses we have marked must be withheld under section 552.137 of the Government Code.

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

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov’t Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by

³The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception like section 552.137 of the Government Code on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Office of the Attorney General at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



M. Alan Akin
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MAA/jb

Ref: ID# 281177

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Pat Hicks
7805 Live Oak Avenue
Jonestown, Texas 78645
(w/o enclosures)