



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 20, 2015

Ms. Heather Silver  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Dallas  
1500 Marilla Street, Room 7DN  
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2015-07564

Dear Ms. Silver:

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# 560615.<sup>1</sup>

The City of Dallas (the "city") received five requests for information pertaining to four specified Dallas Animal Services intake numbers. The city states it will release some of the requested information upon the requestors' responses to cost estimates. You claim portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107, 552.111, 552.136, and 552.137 of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>We note we have combined these requests, which originally were assigned identification numbers 560615 and 560624, under ID# 560615.

<sup>2</sup>Although you also raise Texas Rule of Evidence 503, we note the proper exception to raise when asserting the attorney-client privilege for information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code is section 552.107 of the Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 1-2 (2002).

<sup>3</sup>We assume 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, you inform us some of the requested information was the subject of a previous request for information, in response to which this office issued Open Records Letter No. 2015-05397 (2015). In Open Records Letter No. 2015-05397, we concluded the city may withhold certain information under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The ruling further held the city must withhold certain information under (1) section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy, (2) to the extent the individuals whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the city may only withhold the cellular telephone numbers at issue if the services are not paid for by a governmental body, and (3) under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless their owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure. The ruling also held the city must release the remaining information. There is no indication the law, facts, and circumstances on which the prior ruling was based have changed. Accordingly, for the requested information that is identical to the information previously requested and ruled upon by this office, we conclude the city must continue to rely on Open Records Letter No. 2015-05397 as a previous determination and withhold or release the identical information in accordance with that ruling. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (so long as law, facts, and circumstances on which prior ruling was based have not changed, first type of previous determination exists where requested information is precisely same information as was addressed in prior attorney general ruling, ruling is addressed to same governmental body, and ruling concludes information is or is not excepted from disclosure). Next, we address your arguments against the disclosure of the submitted information that is not subject to this prior ruling.

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 that are 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.

You assert Exhibits B and C and the information you highlighted in yellow in Exhibit D consist of draft versions of documents you state will be released to the public in their final form or communications "used to craft" the draft documents. You further assert the communications reveal portions of the draft documents. Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we find the city has demonstrated some of the information at issue consists of advice, opinions, or recommendations on the policymaking matters of the city. Thus, the city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code.<sup>4</sup> However, we find the remaining information at issue does not consist of advice, opinion, or recommendation, but rather consists of general administrative or purely factual information. Thus, we conclude the city failed to demonstrate how this information is excepted under section 552.111. Consequently, the city may not withhold any of this information under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

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 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

---

<sup>4</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made “to facilitate 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 only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives. 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: (A) to whom disclosure is made to further the rendition of professional legal services to the client; or (B) reasonably necessary to transmit 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, orig. proceeding). 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 seek to withhold portion of Exhibit E under section 552.107 of the Government Code. You state the information at issue consists of a communication between attorneys for the city and city employees. You state the communication was made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the city. You further state this communication was intended to be confidential and 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 information you highlighted in Exhibit E under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.117(a)(1) excepts from disclosure the home address and telephone number, emergency contact information, social security number, and family member information of current or former employees or officials of a governmental body who request this

information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code.<sup>5</sup> *See* Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). Whether a particular item of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Thus, information may be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) only on behalf of a current or former employee or official who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. Information may not be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee or official who did not timely request under section 552.024 the information be kept confidential. Section 552.117 is also applicable to personal cellular telephone numbers, provided the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-6 (1988) (section 552.117 not applicable to cellular telephone numbers paid for by governmental body and intended for official use). Therefore, to the extent the individual whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the city may only withhold the cellular telephone number at issue if the service is not paid for by a governmental body. Conversely, to the extent the individual at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024, the city may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.117(a)(1).

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* Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the e-mail address you highlighted in pink under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless its owner affirmatively consents to its public disclosure.

In summary, for the requested information that is identical to the information previously requested and ruled upon by this office, we conclude the city must continue to rely on Open Records Letter No. 2015-05397 as a previous determination and withhold or release the identical information in accordance with that ruling. The city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code and the information you highlighted in Exhibit E under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. To the extent the individual whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the city may only withhold the cellular telephone number at issue if the service is not paid for by a governmental body.

---

<sup>5</sup>The 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).

The city must withhold the e-mail address you highlighted in pink under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless its owner affirmatively consents to its public disclosure. 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](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 that reads "Paige Thompson". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Paige Thompson  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

PT/dls

Ref: ID# 560615

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 2 Requestors  
(w/o enclosures)