



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 9, 2016

Ms. Patricia A. Rigney  
City Attorney  
City of Pharr  
P.O. Box 1729  
Pharr, Texas 78577

OR2016-27287

Dear Ms. Rigney:

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# 637734 (ORR# 2016-369).

The City of Pharr (the "city") received a request for communications related to a specified event; personnel action forms related to any employee who received payment in connection with the event; and any agreements with, invoices from, and payments to a specified entity. You state the city does not maintain information responsive to a portion of the request.<sup>1</sup> You state the city is releasing some of the requested information. 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.<sup>2</sup> We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

---

<sup>1</sup>The Act does not require a governmental body that receives a request for information to create information that did not exist when the request was received. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 563 at 8 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

<sup>2</sup>Although you also raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with Texas Rule of Evidence 503, this office has concluded section 552.101 does not encompass discovery privileges. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 1-2 (2002), 575 at 2 (1990).

Initially, we note some of the submitted information, which we have marked, is not responsive to the instant request for information because it was created after the city received the request for information. This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the request and the city is not required to release such information in response to this request.

Next, we note some of the responsive information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides, in relevant part:

(a) [T]he following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

...

(3) information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of public or other funds by a governmental body[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(3). The submitted information includes information in an account, contract, or voucher relating to the receipt or expenditure of funds by the city that is subject to section 552.022(a)(3). You seek to withhold the information subject to section 552.022(a)(3) under section 552.107 of the Government Code and the deliberative process privilege of section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, sections 552.107 and 552.111 are discretionary in nature and do not make information confidential under the Act. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 10-11 (2002) (attorney-client privilege under Gov't Code § 552.107(1) may be waived), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions), 470 at 7 (1987) (statutory predecessor to section 552.111 subject to waiver). Therefore, the information subject to section 552.022, which we have marked, may not be withheld under section 552.107 or section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, the Texas Supreme Court has held 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). We will therefore consider your assertion of the attorney-client privilege under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. Further, because section 552.136 of the Government Code makes information confidential under the Act, we will consider the applicability of section 552.136 for the information at issue.<sup>3</sup> We will also address your arguments under sections 552.107 and 552.111 of the

---

<sup>3</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).

Government Code against disclosure of the responsive information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code.

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

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).

Thus, in order to withhold attorney-client privileged information from disclosure under rule 503, a governmental body must (1) show 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 the communication is confidential by explaining it was not intended to be disclosed to third persons and it was made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client. Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the information is privileged and confidential under rule 503, provided the client has not waived the privilege or the document does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in rule 503(d). *See Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, orig. proceeding).

You assert the information subject to section 552.022(a)(3) of the Government Code consists of privileged attorney-client communications. You indicate the information was

communicated between city officials and staff. Upon review, however, we find some of the information at issue was received from an entity that is not a privileged party. We also find the remaining information at issue was not communicated to further the rendition of legal services to the city. Upon review, therefore, we find the city has not established the information at issue constitutes privileged attorney-client communications under rule 503. Thus, the city may not withhold the information at issue pursuant to rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.

You claim section 552.107 of the Government Code for the information not subject to section 552.022. Section 552.107(1) protects information that comes within the attorney-client privilege. The elements of the privilege under section 552.107 are the same as those discussed 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* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). 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 responsive information not subject to section 552.022(a)(3) is protected by section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. You state the information at issue consists of communications involving the city's attorney and city employees in their capacities as clients. You state the communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the city and you state 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 some of the information at issue, which we have marked. Thus, the city may withhold the communications we marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. However, we find the remaining information you seek to withhold has been shared with individuals you have not demonstrated are privileged parties or the communications at issue were not made to further the rendition of professional legal services to the city. Therefore, we conclude you have failed to establish the remaining responsive information constitutes privileged attorney-client communications for the purposes of section 552.107(1), and this information may not be withheld under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

You claim the remaining responsive information is protected under section 552.111 of the Government Code. Section 552.111 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 argue the remaining responsive information consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations of city officials, employees, and legal counsel. Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we find portions of the information at issue, which we have marked, consist 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. As noted above, however, some of the information you seek to withhold has been shared with individuals with whom you have not demonstrated the city shares a privity of interest. Further, the

remaining information at issue is general administrative and purely factual information or does not pertain to policymaking. Thus, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home address and telephone number, emergency contact information, social security number, and family member information of a current or former employee or official of a governmental body who requests this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). We note 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). 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. The remaining responsive information contains the cellular telephone numbers of city employees and officials. To the extent the city employees and officials whose cellular telephone numbers are at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code and a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service, the city must withhold the cellular telephone numbers of city employees and officials within the remaining responsive information under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. Conversely, to the extent the city employees and officials at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024 or a governmental body pays for the cellular telephone service, the city may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.117(a)(1).

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." Gov't Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining "access device"). Accordingly, the city must withhold the partial credit card number we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

The remaining information contains e-mail addresses that may be subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code. Section 552.137 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). Section 552.137 is not applicable to an institutional e-mail address, an

Internet website address, or an e-mail address of an officials or employees of the governmental body. *See Austin Bulldog v. Leffingwell*, 490 S.W.3d 240 (Tex. App.—Austin 2016, no pet.) (holding personal e-mail addresses of government officials used to conduct official government business are not e-mail addresses of “members of the public” for purposes of Gov’t Code § 552.137(a)). Under section 552.137, a governmental body must withhold the e-mail address of a member of the general public, unless the individual to whom the e-mail address belongs affirmatively consents to its public disclosure. *See id.* § 552.137(b). Because we are unable to discern whether the e-mail addresses within the remaining responsive documents fall within the scope of section 552.137(c), we must rule conditionally. To the extent the e-mail addresses at issue, which we have noted, belong to members of the public, the city must withhold such e-mail addresses under section 552.137, unless the individuals to whom the e-mail addresses belong affirmatively consent to their release. *See id.* § 552.137(b). However, to the extent the e-mail addresses we noted are excluded by subsection 552.137(c), the e-mail addresses may not be withheld under section 552.137 of the Government Code.


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.

In summary, the city may withhold the communications we marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. To the extent the city employees and officials whose cellular telephone numbers are at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code and a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service, the city must withhold the cellular telephone numbers of city employees and officials within the remaining responsive information under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the partial credit card number we marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. To the extent the e-mail addresses at issue are not excluded by subsection 552.137(c) of the Government Code, the city must withhold the personal e-mail addresses we noted under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure. The city must release the remaining information; however, any information that is subject to copyright may be released only 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](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, appearing to read "Claire Morris Sloan". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Claire V. Morris Sloan  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CVMS/som

Ref: ID# 637734

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)