



January 7, 2015

Mr. Jeffrey T. Ulmann
Counsel for City of Bartlett
Knight & Partners
223 West Anderson Lane, Suite A-105
Austin, Texas 78752

OR2015-00214

Dear Mr. Ulmann:

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# 549111.

The City of Bartlett (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for 1) all documents pertaining to a named individual, 2) the minutes of a specified city council meeting, 3) all documents pertaining to the hiring of a specified position, 4) all documents pertaining to payments made by the city to a named individual, and 5) all documents pertaining to any settlement reached between the city and a named former employee. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107, 552.111, and 552.131 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

¹Although you also raise section 552.101 of the Government Code, you make no arguments to support this exception. Therefore, we assume you have withdrawn your claim that this section applies to the submitted information. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .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.

Initially, we note the city has only submitted information responsive to the first and fifth categories of the present request. To the extent information responsive to the remainder of the request existed on the date the city received the request, we assume you have released it. *See* Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (if governmental body concludes no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible). If you have not released any such information, you must do so at this time. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301(a), .302.

Next, 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:

...

(18) a settlement agreement to which a governmental body is a party.

Id. § 552.022(a)(18). The submitted information includes a settlement agreement, which we have marked, subject to subsection 552.022(a)(18). The city may only withhold the information subject to subsection 552.022(a)(18) if it is made confidential under the Act or other law. Although you raise sections 552.107, 552.111, and 552.131(b) for the information subject to section 552.022, these sections are discretionary and do not make information confidential under the Act. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 6 (2002) (attorney-client privilege under section 552.107 may be waived), 663 at 5 (1999) (governmental body may waive section 552.111); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). Therefore, the city may not withhold the information subject to section 552.022 under section 552.107, 552.111, or 552.131(b). The city also raises section 552.131(a) of the Government Code for this information. Although section 552.131(a) does make information confidential under the Act, this section only protects the proprietary interests of third parties that have provided information to governmental bodies, not the interests of governmental bodies themselves. Therefore, the city may not withhold the information at issue on that ground. However, the Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Evidence are "other law" within the meaning of section 552.022 of the Government Code. *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 at issue. We will also consider your arguments for the information not subject to section 552.022.

Texas Rule of Evidence 503 enacts the attorney-client privilege. Rule 503(b)(1) provides as follows:

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

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

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

(C) by the client or a representative of the client, or the client's lawyer or a representative of the lawyer, to a lawyer or a representative of a lawyer representing another party in a pending action and concerning a matter of common interest therein;

(D) between representatives of the client or between the client and a representative of the client; 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, no writ).

You state the information subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code consists of a communication between attorneys for the city, representatives of the city's attorneys, and city employees that was made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of legal services to the city. You state the communication was intended to be confidential and has remained confidential. However, the information at issue consists of a communication with parties whom you have not established are privileged parties for purposes of Texas Rule of Evidence 503. Thus, we find you have not demonstrated the information at issue is a

privileged attorney-client communication for the purposes of rule 503. Therefore, none of the information at issue may be withheld under Texas Rule of Evidence 503.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information that comes within the attorney-client privilege. The elements of the privilege under section 552.107 are the same as those discussed above 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).

You state the information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code consists of communications between attorneys for the city, representatives of the city's attorneys, and city employees that were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of legal services to the city. You state the communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find the information at issue consists of privileged attorney-client communications the city may generally withhold under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.³ We note, however, some of these otherwise privileged e-mail strings include e-mails received from or sent to non-privileged parties. Furthermore, if the e-mails received from or sent to non-privileged parties are removed from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear and stand alone, they are responsive to the request for information. Therefore, if these non-privileged e-mails, which we have marked, are maintained by the city separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then the city may not withhold these non-privileged e-mails under section 552.107(1). In that event, we address your remaining arguments against disclosure of the non-privileged e-mails.

Section 552.111 of the Government Code 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, 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.*

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

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 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).

Further, section 552.111 does not protect facts and written observations of facts and events severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.); *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).

Section 552.111 can also encompass communications between a governmental body and a third party, including a consultant or other party with a privity of interest. *See* Open Records Decision No. 561 at 9 (1990) (section 552.111 encompasses communications with party with which governmental body has privity of interest or common deliberative process). For section 552.111 to apply, the governmental body must identify the third party and explain the nature of its relationship with the governmental body. Section 552.111 is not applicable to a communication between the governmental body and a third party unless the governmental body establishes it has a privity of interest or common deliberative process with the third party. *See* ORD 561.

Upon review, we find you have not demonstrated a privity of interest between the city and all of the parties in the non-privileged e-mails we have marked. Additionally, the remaining information at issue does not consist of advice, opinions, or recommendations on a policymaking matter. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any portion of the information at issue under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Section 552.131 of the Government Code provides as follows:

- (a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if the information relates to economic development negotiations involving a governmental body and a business prospect that the governmental body seeks to have locate, stay, or expand in or near the territory of the governmental body and the information relates to:

(1) a trade secret of the business prospect; or

(2) commercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that disclosure would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained.

(b) Unless and until an agreement is made with the business prospect, information about a financial or other incentive being offered to the business prospect by the governmental body or by another person is excepted from [required public disclosure].

Gov't Code § 552.131(a), (b). Section 552.131(a) only protects the proprietary interests of third parties that have provided information to governmental bodies, not the interests of governmental bodies themselves. In this instance, there has been no demonstration by a third party that any of the information at issue in the non-privileged e-mails constitutes a trade secret or that release of any of the information at issue would cause a third party substantial competitive harm. *See generally* Open Records Decision Nos.661 at 5-6 (1999) (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm), 552 at 5 (1990) (attorney general will accept private person's claim under section 552.110(a) if person establishes *prima facie* case for trade secret exception, and no one submits argument that rebuts claim as matter of law). We therefore conclude the city may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.131(a) of the Government Code.

Section 552.131(b) protects information about a financial or other incentive that is being offered to a business prospect by a governmental body or another person. Gov't Code § 552.131(b). You state the information in the non-privileged e-mails relates to ongoing economic development negotiations between the city and a business prospect. You state the release of the information at issue could cause substantial harm to those negotiations. However, upon review, we find you have not demonstrated how any portion of the information at issue reveals financial or other incentives that are being offered to a business prospect. Thus, we conclude the city may not withhold any portion of the information at issue under section 552.131(b) of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must release the information subject to section 552.022(a)(18) of the Government Code. The city may generally withhold the information not subject to section 552.022 under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code; however, the city may not withhold the marked non-privileged e-mails if they are maintained separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear. The city must release the remaining information.

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Meredith L. Coffman', with a long, sweeping horizontal line extending to the right.

Meredith L. Coffman
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MLC/dls

Ref: ID# 549111

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)