



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 19, 2015

Mr. Guillermo Trevino
Assistant City Attorney
City of Fort Worth
1000 Throckmorton Street, 3rd Floor
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

OR2015-24371

Dear Mr. Trevino:

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# 587736 (Fort Worth Reference No. W045372).

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to the requestor's termination. You state you have released some information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107 and 552.111 of the Government Code, and privileged under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.¹

We note some of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022(a)(1) of the Government Code. This section provides for the required public disclosure of "a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body," unless the information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or made confidential under the Act or other law. Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). Although the city asserts the information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107, this section

¹We 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.

is a discretionary exception to disclosure that protects a governmental body's interest and does not make information confidential. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 10-11 (2002) (attorney-client privilege under section 552.107(1) may be waived), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). Therefore, the city may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.107. However, the Texas Supreme Court has held that the Texas Rules of Evidence are "other law" within the meaning of section 552.022. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). Accordingly, we will consider the city's assertion of the attorney-client privilege under Texas Rule of Evidence 503.

Texas Rule of Evidence 503(b)(1) provides:

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

- (A) between the client or the client's representative and the client's lawyer or the lawyer's representative;
- (B) between the client's lawyer and the lawyer's representative;
- (C) by the client, the client's representative, the client's lawyer, or the lawyer's representative to a lawyer representing another party in a pending action or that lawyer's representative, if the communications concern a matter of common interest in the pending action;
- (D) between the client's representatives or between the client and the client's representative; 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).

Accordingly, in order to withhold attorney-client privileged information from disclosure under Rule 503, a governmental body must 1) show that 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 that the communication is confidential by explaining that it was not intended to be disclosed to third persons and that

it was made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client. *See* ORD 676. Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the entire communication is confidential under Rule 503 provided the client has not waived the privilege or the communication 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 attaches to complete communication, including factual information).

You assert the information subject to section 552.022 consists of attachments to privileged attorney-client communications between the city's attorneys and city staff or officials. You state the communications at issue were made for the purpose of the rendition of legal services to the city. You indicate these communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Based on the city's representations and our review of the information at issue, we find the city has established the information at issue constitutes attorney-client communications under Rule 503. Thus, the city may withhold the information subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code, which we have marked, pursuant to Rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.²

The city claims section 552.107 of the Government Code for the remaining information in Exhibit C-1. Section 552.107(1) protects information that comes within the attorney-client privilege. *See* Gov't Code § 552.107(1). The elements of the privilege under section 552.107 are the same as those 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. *See Huie*, 922 S.W.2d at 923.

The city states the remaining information in Exhibit C-1 consists of communications involving the city's attorneys and city employees and officials. The city states the communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the city and these communications have remained confidential. Upon review, we find the city has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Thus, the city may withhold the remaining information in Exhibit C-1 under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.³

²As we are able to make this determination, we need not address your remaining claim for this information.

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

Section 552.111 of the Government Code exempts 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, we determined section 552.111 exempts 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, 364 (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). 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, 157 (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, section 552.111 protects the factual information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 313 at 3 (1982).

This office has also concluded section 552.111 exempts from disclosure a preliminary draft of a document intended for public release in its final form because the draft necessarily represents the drafter’s advice, opinion, and recommendation with regard to the form and content of the final document. *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 of a preliminary draft of a policymaking document, including comments, underlining, deletions, and proofreading marks, that will be released to the public in its final form. *See id.* at 2.

The city asserts the information in Exhibit C-2 is protected under section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, we note the information at issue pertains to personnel matters concerning only the individual at issue. The city has not demonstrated this information involves policymaking pertaining to personnel matters of a broad scope. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city may withhold the information subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code, which we have marked, pursuant to Rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. The city may withhold the remaining information in Exhibit C-1 under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information.⁴

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,



Cristian Rosas-Grillet
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CRG/akg

Ref: ID# 587736

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

⁴We note the requestor has a right of access to his personal information that might otherwise be excepted from disclosure under section 552.117 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a) (person or person's authorized representative has a special right of access to records that contain information relating to the person that are protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect that person's privacy interests). Because such information is confidential with respect to the general public, if the city receives another request for this information from a different requestor, then the city should again seek a ruling from this office.