



February 17, 2015

Mr. Ryan D. Pittman
Counsel for the City of Frisco
Abernathy Roeder Boyd & Joplin, P.C.
P.O. Box 1210
McKinney, Texas 75070-1210

OR2015-03113

Dear Mr. Pittman:

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# 553680.

The City of Frisco (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for e-mails from the police chief during a specified period of time. You state you will release some information. You claim some of the remaining information is not subject to the Act. You also claim the remaining information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, 552.108, 552.109, 552.111, 552.117, 552.136, and 552.137 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, you argue a portion of the submitted information is not subject to the Act. The Act applies to "public information," which is defined in section 552.002(a) of the Government Code as

information that is written, produced, collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business:

¹Although you raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with Texas Rule of Evidence 503, this office has concluded section 552.101 does not encompass discovery privileges. See Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 1-2 (2002), 575 at 2 (1990).

- (1) by a governmental body; or
- (2) for a governmental body and the governmental body:
 - (A) owns the information;
 - (B) has a right of access to the information; or
 - (C) spends or contributes public money for the purpose of writing, producing, collecting, assembling, or maintaining the information; or
- (3) by an individual officer or employee of a governmental body in the officer's or employee's official capacity and the information pertains to official business of the governmental body.

Gov't Code § 552.002(a). Information is "in connection with the transaction of official business" if it is "created by, transmitted to, received by, or maintained by an officer or employee of the governmental body in the officer's or employee's official capacity, or a person or entity performing official business or a government function on behalf of a governmental body, and pertains to official business of the governmental body." *Id.* § 552.002(a-1). Thus, virtually all of the information in a governmental body's physical possession constitutes public information and is subject to the Act. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 549 at 4 (1990), 514 at 1-2 (1988).

You indicate some of the submitted information consists of personal e-mails and does not pertain to official city business. Based on your representations and our review of the submitted information, we find some of the information at issue does not constitute public information for purposes of section 552.002 of the Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 635 at 4 (1995) (section 552.002 not applicable to personal information unrelated to official business and created or maintained by state employee involving de minimis use of state resources). Therefore, this information, which we have marked, is not subject to the Act, and the city need not release it in response to this request. However, we conclude the remaining e-mails at issue were written, produced, collected, assembled, or maintained in connection with the transaction of official business by employees of the city in their official capacities. Thus, this information is subject to the Act and the city must release it unless it demonstrates the information falls within an exception to public disclosure under the Act. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.006, .021, .301, .302.

Next, we note the submitted information contains a court-filed document subject to section 552.022(a)(17) 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:

...

(17) information that is also contained in a public court record[.]

Id. § 552.022(a)(17). The city must release the information subject to section 552.022(a)(17) unless it is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* Although you seek to withhold the court-filed document under sections 552.103 and 552.107(1) of the Government Code, these are discretionary exceptions to disclosure 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 Gov't Code § 552.103); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 6 (2002) (Gov't Code § 552.107(1) is not other law for purposes of Gov't Code § 552.022), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). Therefore, the city may not withhold the court-filed document under section 552.103 or section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The Texas Supreme Court has held, however, that the Texas Rules of Evidence are “other law” that makes information expressly confidential for purposes of section 552.022. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). Therefore, we will address your claim under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 for the court-filed document. We will also consider your arguments against disclosure of the remaining 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). *Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein); *In re Valero Energy Corp.*, 973 S.W.2d 453, 457 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1998, orig. proceeding) (privilege extends to entire communication, including factual information).

You assert the submitted court-filed document is an attachment to a confidential communication between city employees and attorneys. You state the communication was made in confidence for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services and this communication has remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Thus, the city may withhold the court-filed document under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.

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(1) 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*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923.

You claim some of the remaining information is protected by section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. You state the information at issue consists of communications between city employees and attorneys. You state the communications were made in confidence for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the city and these communications have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the

information at issue. Thus, the city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.²

Section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. . . if. . . release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime.” Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(1). A governmental body claiming section 552.108 must reasonably explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You state the information you have marked relates to open and pending criminal investigations. Based upon this representation, we conclude release of the submitted information you have marked would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See Houston Chronicle Publ’g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases), *writ ref’d n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Thus, the city may withhold this information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.³

Section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the internal records and notations of law enforcement agencies and prosecutors when their release would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. Gov’t Code § 552.108(b)(1); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 531 at 2 (1989) (quoting *Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977)). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(b)(1) must reasonably explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See* Gov’t Code §§ 552.108(b)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706. Section 552.108(b)(1) is intended to protect “information which, if released, would permit private citizens to anticipate weaknesses in a police department, avoid detection, jeopardize officer safety, and generally undermine police efforts to effectuate the laws of this State.” *See City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320, 327 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.). This office has concluded section 552.108(b)(1) excepts from public disclosure information relating to the security or operation of a law enforcement agency. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 (release of detailed use of force guidelines would unduly interfere with law enforcement), 252 (1980) (section 552.108 of the Government Code is designed to protect investigative techniques and procedures used in law enforcement), 143 (1976) (disclosure of specific operations or specialized equipment directly related to investigation or detection of crime may be excepted). Section 552.108(b)(1) is not applicable, however, to generally known policies and procedures. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 at 2–3 (Penal Code provisions, common law rules, and constitutional limitations on use of force not protected), 252 at 3 (governmental body failed to indicate why investigative

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against its disclosure.

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

procedures and techniques requested were any different from those commonly known). You have not explained how release of the information you have marked would interfere with law enforcement. Thus, we find you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.108(b)(1) to the information you have marked, and the city may not withhold it under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code.

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, 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 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).

This office has also concluded a preliminary draft of a 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.

Section 552.111 can also encompass communications between a governmental body and a third party, including a consultant or other party, with which the governmental body establishes it has a privity of interest or common deliberative process. *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.

You state some of the remaining information consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations relating to administrative, personnel, health and safety policymaking matters of the city. Further, we note some of the communications at issue involve third parties, with which the city shares a privity of interest. We note some of the information consists of a draft document. However, you do not explain whether the draft document will be released in its final form. Thus, we must rule conditionally. Accordingly, to the extent the draft document we have marked will be released to the public in its final form, the city may withhold it in its entirety under section 552.111. If the draft document will not be released to the public in its final form, then the city may not withhold it in its entirety under section 552.111. In this case, we find portions of the draft document constitute advice, opinions, or recommendations. Thus, to the extent the draft document will not be released in final form, the city may withhold the information we noted under section 552.111 of the Government Code within the draft document. Further, we find the remaining information we have marked consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations pertaining to a policymaking matter. Accordingly, the city may withhold the remaining information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code.⁴ However, we find some of the remaining information at issue consists of either general administrative information that does not relate to policymaking or information that is purely factual in nature. Accordingly, the remaining information may not be withheld under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. Upon review, we

⁴As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure.

find you have not demonstrated how any of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.109 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[p]rivate correspondence or communications of an elected office holder relating to matters the disclosure of which would constitute an invasion of privacy [.]” Gov’t Code § 552.109. This office has held the test to be applied to information under section 552.109 is the same as the common-law privacy standard under section 552.101 of the Government Code as discussed above. *Indus. Found*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate how any of the remaining information constitutes highly intimate or embarrassing information that is of no legitimate concern to the public. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.109 of the Government Code.

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). *See id.* The e-mail address at issue is not excluded by subsection (c). Therefore, the city must withhold the personal e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner affirmatively consents to its public disclosure.

Lastly, we note some of the remaining information is subject to section 552.130 of the Government Code.⁵ Section 552.130 provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator’s license, driver’s license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release. *See id.* § 552.130. Accordingly, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the information we have marked is not subject to the Act and the city need not release it in response to this request. The city may withhold the court-filed document under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. The city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.107 of the Government Code. To the extent the draft document we have marked will be released to the public in its final form, the city may withhold it in its entirety under section 552.111 of the Government Code. To the extent the draft document will not be released in final form, the city may withhold the information we noted under section 552.111 within the draft document, as well as the additional information we have

⁵The 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).

marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the personal e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner affirmatively consents to its public disclosure. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. 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,



Paige Lay
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

PL/som

Ref: ID# 553680

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)