



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 23, 2016

Ms. Lacey B. Lucas  
Assistant District Attorney  
Dallas County District Attorney's Office  
411 Elm Street, Fifth Floor  
Dallas, Texas 75202-3317

OR2016-11786

Dear Ms. Lucas:

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# 611077.

Dallas County (the "county") received a request for all e-mails containing specified search terms during a specified time period. You state you have released some information to the requestor. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107 and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>1</sup>

Initially, we note some of the submitted information is not responsive to the instant request because it does not contain the specified search terms. This ruling does not address the public availability of the non-responsive information, which we have marked, and the county need not release it in response to the request.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. *See* Gov't Code § 552.107(1). 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 the information constitutes or documents a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the

---

<sup>1</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 those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

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 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 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 Exhibit B is protected by section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. You state the information at issue consists of communications involving the county’s attorneys and employees. You indicate the communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the county 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 portions of the responsive e-mails in Exhibit B. We note, however, some of these e-mail strings include e-mails received from or sent to non-privileged parties. Furthermore, if the e-mails received from or sent to non-privileged parties are removed from the e-mail strings and stand alone, they are responsive to the request for information. Therefore, if these non-privileged e-mails, which we have marked, are maintained by the county separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then the county may not withhold these non-privileged e-mails under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. Additionally, we find a portion of the responsive information in Exhibit B has been shared with an individual you have not demonstrated is a privileged party. Therefore, we conclude you have failed to establish the remaining responsive information in Exhibit B, which we marked for release, constitutes communications between or among city employees and attorneys for the purposes

of section 552.107(1). Thus, the county may not withhold the remaining responsive information we marked for release in Exhibit B on that basis.

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).

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* ORD 561.

You state the responsive e-mails in Exhibit C consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations of county officials and employees. You explain this information is reflective of the deliberative process by which the county sought to understand the issue at hand and decide on a course of action. Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we find the county has demonstrated portions of the information at issue, which we have marked, consist of advice, opinions, or recommendations on the policymaking matters of the county. Thus, the county may withhold the marked information in Exhibit C under section 552.111 of the Government Code. Upon review, however, we find the remaining responsive information in Exhibit C is general administrative and purely factual information or does not pertain to policymaking. Further, some of the remaining information was received from an individual with whom you have not demonstrated the county shares a privity of interest or common deliberative process. Thus, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining responsive information at issue consists of internal communications containing advice, opinions, or recommendations on the policymaking matters of the county. Accordingly, the county may not withhold the remaining information at issue under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

We note some of the remaining information is subject to sections 552.130, 552.136, and 552.137 of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> Section 552.130 of the Government Code 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* Gov't Code § 552.130. Upon review, we find portions of the remaining information consist of motor vehicle record information. Accordingly, the county must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides, "Notwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential." *Id.* § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining "access device"). Accordingly, the county must withhold the account number we have marked under section 552.136 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.* § 552.137(a)-(c). Section 552.137 is not applicable to an institutional e-mail address, the general e-mail address of a business, an Internet website address, an e-mail address of a person who has a contractual relationship with a governmental body, an e-mail address of a vendor who seeks

---

<sup>2</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

to contract with a governmental body, an e-mail address that a governmental entity maintains for one of its officials or employees, or an e-mail address provided to a governmental body on a letterhead. *See id.* § 552.137(c). We note the requestor has a right to his own e-mail address under section 552.137(b). *Id.* § 552.137(b). The e-mail address at issue is not excluded by subsection (c). Therefore, the county 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.

In summary, with the exception of the information we marked for release, the county may generally withhold the e-mails in Exhibit B under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. However, if the non-privileged e-mails, which we have marked, are maintained by the county separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then the county may not withhold these non-privileged e-mails under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The county may withhold the marked information in Exhibit C under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The county must withhold: (1) the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code, (2) the account number we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code, and (3) 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 remaining information must be released.

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,



Gerald A. Arismendez  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

GAA/dls

Ref: ID# 611077

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)