



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

June 28, 2011

Ms. Monica Hernandez
Assistant City Attorney
City of San Antonio
P.O. Box 839966
San Antonio, Texas 78283

OR2011-09208

Dear Ms. Hernandez:

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# 422355 (COSA# W0000547-041111).

The City of San Antonio (the "city") received a request for any and all documentation related to any Sea World related transactions with the city's Animal Care Services Department ("ACS"). You state you will release some responsive information to the requestor. You claim the remaining requested 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

Initially, we note some of the submitted information was created after the request was received. This information, which we have marked, is not responsive to the instant request for information. This decision does not address the public availability of information that is not responsive to the request.

¹This letter ruling assumes that the submitted representative sample of information is truly representative of the requested information as a whole. This ruling does not reach, and therefore does not authorize, the withholding of any other requested information to the extent that the other information is substantially different than that submitted to this office. See Gov't Code §§ 552.301(e)(1)(D), .302; Open Records Decision Nos. 499 at 6 (1988), 497 at 4 (1988).

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. Gov't Code § 552.107(1). 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 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 to only communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives. 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 to only 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 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 e-mail correspondence you have marked in Attachment 3 constitutes confidential communications among the city's employees and its legal counsel that were made for the purpose of providing legal services to the city. You also state that the communications were intended to be, and have remained, confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we conclude the city may withhold the e-mails you have marked in Attachment 3 on the basis of the attorney-client privilege under section 552.107 of the Government Code. We note, however, several of the individual e-mails contained in the otherwise privileged e-mail strings are communications with an individual who is not a privileged party. Thus, to the extent these non-privileged e-mails, which we have marked,

exist separate and apart from the submitted e-mail strings, they may not be withheld under section 552.107 of the Government Code.

We note one of the non-privileged e-mails contains an e-mail address subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code.² Section 552.137 of the Government Code 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). Gov’t Code § 552.137(a)-(c). We note section 552.137 is not applicable to an institutional e-mail address, an Internet website address, the general e-mail address of a business, an e-mail address of a person who has a contractual relationship with a governmental body, or an e-mail address maintained by a governmental entity for one of its officials or employees. The e-mail address we have marked is not a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). Accordingly, the city must withhold the e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code unless the owner of the address has affirmatively consented to its release under section 552.137(b).³

You seek to withhold a portion of the remaining information in Attachment 3 under the deliberative process privilege encompassed by section 552.111 of the Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 615 at 2 (1993). 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.” Gov’t Code § 552.111. Section 552.111 encompasses the deliberative process privilege. *See* ORD 615 at 2. The purpose of section 552.111 is to protect advice, opinions, and recommendations 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 reexamined 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, opinions, and other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the governmental body. *See* ORD 615 at 5. A governmental body’s policymaking functions include administrative and personnel matters of broad scope that affect the governmental

²The 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).

³We note this office issued Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009), a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold ten categories of information, including an e-mail address of a member of the public under section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

body's policy mission. *See* Open Records Decision No. 631 at 3 (1995). However, 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. ORD 615 at 5-6; *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). Further, section 552.111 does not generally except from disclosure 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, opinions, or recommendations 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 has been or 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 contend the draft documents in Attachment 3 contain the advice, opinions, and recommendations regarding the city's policy matters which pertain to a high-profile project that is the basis for on-going negotiations and deliberations. You also state the city will release the document to the public in its final form. Upon review, we find the draft documents in Attachment 3 constitute several drafts of a policymaking document. Accordingly, the city may withhold the draft documents under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city may withhold the e-mail correspondence you have marked in Attachment 3 under section 552.107 of the Government Code; however, to the extent the marked non-privileged e-mails exist separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings, the non-privileged e-mails may not be withheld under section 552.107. The city must withhold the e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code unless the owner of the address has affirmatively consented to its release. The city may withhold the draft documents in Attachment 3 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 cursive script that reads "Kirsten Brew".

Kirsten Brew
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KB/em

Ref: ID# 422355

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)