



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

August 1, 2007

Mr. Jason D. King
Akers & Boulware-Wells, LLP
816 Congress Avenue, Suite 1725
Austin, Texas 78701

OR2007-09731

Dear Mr. King:

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#285369.

The City of Rollingwood (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for eleven categories of information pertaining to two former members of the city council, the Lower Colorado River Authority, and the city. You claim that portions of the submitted information are 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.

You inform us that the submitted information was the subject of a previous request for information in response to which this office issued Open Records Letter No. 2007-05269 (2007). See Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (governmental body may rely on previous determination when (1) the records or information at issue are precisely the same records or information that were previously submitted to this office pursuant to section 552.301(e)(1)(D); (2) the governmental body which received the request for the records or information is the same governmental body that previously requested and received a ruling from the attorney general; (3) the prior ruling concluded that the precise records or information are or are not excepted from disclosure under the Act; and (4) the law, facts, and

¹You also raise section 552.101 in conjunction with the attorney-client privilege. We note that section 552.101 does not encompass discovery privileges. See Open Records Decision No. 676 at 1-3 (2002).

circumstances on which the prior ruling was based have not changed since the issuance of the ruling).

However, you inform us that relevant facts and circumstances have changed since the issuance of Open Records Letter No. 2007-05269. In Open Records Letter No. 2007-05259 we determined that the information at issue may be withheld under section 552.103 of the Government Code because the city anticipated litigation on the date it received the request for information. However, you advise us that the litigation at issue is no longer ongoing. As circumstances have changed since the issuance of this letter, the city may no longer rely on Open Records Letter No. 2007-05269. Accordingly, we will address your claimed exceptions.

You seek to withhold Exhibits C, D, and E under section 552.107 of the Government Code. Section 552.107(1) protects information 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, 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 state that the information at issue consists of communications from individuals who were “members of the city’s governing body” to the city’s attorney. You further explain that the communications “were made as part of the process to negotiate/prepare a contract that legal counsel was working on for the city” and that these communications were “not intended to be disclosed.” Based upon your arguments and our review, we determine that Exhibits D, and E, and the information we have marked in Exhibit C may be withheld as privileged attorney-client communications under section 552.107 of the Government Code. Upon review, we find that you have failed to demonstrate that the remaining information constitutes privileged attorney client communications, and it may not be withheld on this basis.

Section 552.111 of the Government Code 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. Section 552.111 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*, 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. 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)*.

You state that the remaining information is “protected from disclosure pursuant to section 552.111 as [it] relates to policy matters of broad scope.” Upon review, however, we determine that you have failed to adequately demonstrate that the remaining information consists of advice, recommendations, opinions, and other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the city. Consequently, the remaining information may not be withheld under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city may withhold Exhibits D, and E, in addition to the information we have marked in Exhibit C under section 552.107 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released to the requestor.

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 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,

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

Holly R. Davis
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

HRD/eeg

Ref: ID# 285369

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Steven Levatino
Davis & Wilkerson, P.C.
P.O. Box 2283
Austin, Texas 78768-2283
(w/o enclosures)