



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 30, 2015

Mr. Michael Bostic
Assistant City Attorney
City of Dallas
Office of the City Attorney
1500 Marilla Street, Room 7DN
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2015-20466

Dear Mr. Bostic:

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# 581273.

The City of Dallas (the "city") received a request for information related to specified applications for low income housing tax credits for the Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs 2015 application cycle. The city claims some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107, 552.111, and 552.137 of the Government Code. The city also states, and provides documentation showing, it notified CHR Carolina Chase, LP, Generation Housing Development, LLC, MV Residential Development, and ZenStar Development, LLC, of the city's receipt of the request for information and of the right of each to submit arguments to this office as to why the requested information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 at 3 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in the Act in certain circumstances). We have considered the claimed exceptions and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.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.

An interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) to submit its reasons, if any, as to why requested information relating to it should be withheld from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, none of the interested third parties has submitted to this office any reasons explaining why the requested information should not be released. Thus, we have no basis for concluding the submitted information constitutes proprietary information of these third parties, and the city may not withhold any portion of it on that basis. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3.

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).

The city explains the e-mails you have marked under section 552.107(1) constitute confidential communications between attorneys for and employees of the city that were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services. The city also asserts the communications were intended to be confidential and their confidentiality has been maintained. Thus, the city may generally withhold the e-mails you have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.² However, we note some of these e-mail strings include an e-mail received from a non-privileged party. Furthermore, if the e-mail received from the non-privileged party is removed from the e-mail strings and stands alone, it is responsive to the request for information. Therefore, if the city maintains the non-privileged e-mail, which we have marked, separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which it appears, then it may not withhold this non-privileged e-mail under section 552.107(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 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).

²As our ruling is dispositive, we do not address the city’s other arguments to withhold this information.

Further, section 552.111 does not protect 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, 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 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 id.* at 9.

The city asserts the remaining information it has marked under section 552.111 consists of advice, opinion, or recommendations on policymaking matters of the city, including draft documents that will be released in final form to the public. Upon review, we find the city has not established the deliberative process privilege is applicable to the non-privileged e-mail we have marked. Therefore, the city may not withhold it under section 552.111. However, we agree the city has established the deliberative process privilege is applicable to the remaining information you have marked under section 552.111. Therefore, the city may withhold the remaining information you have marked under section 552.111 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.* Gov't Code 552.137(a)-(c). Section 552.137 does not apply to a government employee's work e-mail address because such an address is not that of the employee as a "member of the

public,” but is instead the address of the individual as a government employee. We note the information you have marked under section 552.137 either does not consist of an e-mail address of a member of the public or is subject to subsection 552.137(c). Therefore, the city may not withhold this information under section 552.137.


We note some of the materials at issue may be protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; see Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit.

To conclude, the city may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code; however, the city must release the non-privileged e-mail we have marked if the city maintains it separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which it appears. The city may withhold the remaining information you have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information, but may only release any copyrighted information in accordance with copyright law.

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,



James L. Coggeshall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JLC/cbz

Ref: ID# 581273

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Chris Applequist
MV Residential Development
Miller-Valentine Group
2800 Routh Street, Suite 218
Dallas, Texas 75201
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Adrian Iglesias
President
Generation Housing Development, LLC
9600 Escarpment Boulevard, Suite 745-101
Austin, Texas 78749
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Terri L. Anderson
Chairperson CHR
CHR Carolina Chase, LP
C/o: Mr. Michael Bostic
Assistant City Attorney
City of Dallas
Office of the City Attorney
1500 Marilla Street, Room 7DN
Dallas, Texas 75201
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Mitchell M. Friedman
Zenstar Development, LLC
9400 South Dadeland Boulevard, Suite 100
Miami, Florida 33156
(w/o enclosures)