



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 21, 2015

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

OR2015-14829

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# 572206.

The City of Dallas (the "city") received a request for ten categories of information pertaining to HR&A Advisors, Inc. and Grant Thornton, L.L.P. during a specified time period. You state you will provide some information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107, 552.111, 552.116, and 552.136 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

Initially, we note the requestor seeks information created after the date the request was received. It is implicit in several provisions of the Act that the Act applies only to information already in existence. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.002, .021, .227, .351. The Act does not require a governmental body to prepare new information in response to a request. *See* Attorney General Opinion H-90 (1973); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 572 at 1

¹We 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 those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

(1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990), 452 at 2-3 (1986), 87 (1975). Consequently, a governmental body is not required to comply with a standing request to supply information prepared in the future. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-48 at 2 (1983); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 476 at 1 (1987), 465 at 1 (1987). Thus, the only information encompassed by the present request consists of information the city maintained or had a right of access to as of the date it received the request.

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 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 claim the information in Exhibit B is protected by section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. You state the information at issue consists of communications between a city attorney and city employees. You indicate the communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the city. You inform us

the communications were intended to be confidential and 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 in Exhibit B under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.²

Section 552.116 of the Government Code provides:

(a) An audit, working paper of an audit of the state auditor or the auditor of a state agency, an institution of higher education as defined by Section 61.003, Education Code, a county, a municipality, a school district, a hospital district, or a joint board operating under Section 22.074, Transportation Code, including any audit relating to the criminal history background check of a public school employee, is excepted from [required public disclosure]. If information in an audit working paper is also maintained in another record, that other record is not excepted from [public disclosure] by this section.

(b) In this section:

(1) "Audit" means an audit authorized or required by a statute of this state or the United States, the charter or an ordinance of a municipality, an order of the commissioners court of a county, the bylaws adopted by or other action of the governing board of a hospital district, a resolution or other action of a board of trustees of a school district, including an audit by the district relating to the criminal history background check of a public school employee, or a resolution or other action of a joint board described by Subsection (a) and includes an investigation.

(2) "Audit working paper" includes all information, documentary or otherwise, prepared or maintained in conducting an audit or preparing an audit report, including:

(A) intra-agency and interagency communications; and

(B) drafts of the audit report or portions of those drafts.

Gov't Code § 552.116. You state the information in Exhibit D pertains to an independent audit undertaken pursuant to the chapter III, section 19 of the city charter. You explain that Grant Thornton, L.L.P. was selected by the city council to conduct this audit pursuant to the

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

provisions of the city charter. You state that the information at issue consists of audit working papers of the city's independent auditor. You further state that the final audit report has not been completed. Based on your representations and our review, we agree the information at issue consists of audit working papers for purposes of section 552.116. Therefore, the city may withhold the information in Exhibit D under section 552.116 of the Government Code.³

In summary, the city may withhold the information in Exhibit B under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The city may withhold the information in Exhibit D under section 552.116 of the Government Code.

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,



Kenny Moreland
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KJM/som

Ref: ID# 572206

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

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