



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 14, 2016

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

OR2016-27668

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# 637556.

The City of Dallas (the "city") received a request for ten categories of information pertaining to a specified project.<sup>1</sup> You state you will release some information. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 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>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>You state the city sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also* *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or overbroad request for information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

<sup>2</sup>We assume the "representative samples" of records submitted to this office are 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.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. This office has repeatedly held that the transfer of confidential information between governmental agencies does not destroy the confidentiality of that information. *See* Attorney General Opinions H-917 (1976), H-836 (1974); Open Records Decision Nos. 561 (1990), 414 (1984), 388 (1983), 272 (1981), 183 (1978). These opinions recognize the need to maintain an unrestricted flow of information between state agencies. In Open Records Decision No. 561, we considered whether the same rule applied regarding information deemed confidential by a federal agency. In that decision, we noted the general rule that section 552 of title 5 of the United States Code, the federal Freedom of Information Act (“FOIA”), applies only to federal agencies and does not apply to records held by state agencies. ORD 561 at 6. Further, we stated information is not confidential when in the hands of a Texas agency simply because the same information is confidential in the hands of a federal agency. *Id.* However, in the interests of comity between state and federal authorities and to ensure the flow of information from federal agencies to Texas governmental bodies, we concluded, “when information in the possession of a federal agency is ‘deemed confidential’ by federal law, such confidentiality is not destroyed by the sharing of the information with a governmental body in Texas. In such an instance, [section 552.101] requires a local government to respect the confidentiality imposed on the information by federal law.” *Id.* at 7.

You assert the United States Army Corps of Engineers (the “Corps”) considers the information you have marked in Exhibit D to be confidential under the personal privacy provisions found in section 552(b)(6) of FOIA. *See* 5 U.S.C. § 552(b)(6)(A) (agency may withhold personnel and medical files and similar files the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy). Additionally, the city states the Corps has informed the city Exhibit F is confidential under the deliberative process privilege found in section 552(b)(5) of title 5 of the United States Code. *See id.* § 552(b)(5) (agency may withhold inter-agency memoranda or letters not available by law to a party other than an agency in litigation with the agency). You indicate, and the information at issue reflects, Exhibit F consists of records of the Corps. Therefore, we conclude the city must withhold Exhibit F under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with federal law. Upon review, however, we find the remaining information at issue is contained in records of the city, which is subject to the state laws of Texas. *See* Attorney General Opinion MW-95 (1979) (FOIA exceptions apply to federal agencies, not to state agencies); Open Records Decision Nos. 496 (1988); *see also Davidson v. Georgia*, 622 F.2d 895, 897 (5th Cir. 1980) (state governments are not subject to FOIA); ORD 561 at 7 n.3 (noting federal authorities may apply confidentiality principles found in FOIA differently from way in which such principles are applied under Texas open records law). Accordingly, the city may not withhold the marked information in Exhibit D under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with FOIA.

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 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 state the information in Exhibit B consists of communications involving attorneys for the city and city employees and officials in their capacities as clients. You state these communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the city. You state these communications were intended to be, 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. Accordingly, the city may withhold Exhibit B 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 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).

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.

You state Exhibit C contains preliminary drafts of documents which will be released to the public in final form. Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we find the city has demonstrated portions of the information at issue, which we have indicated, consist of advice, opinions, or recommendations on the policymaking matters of

the city. Thus, the city may withhold the marked information under section 552.111 of the Government Code. Upon review, however, we find the remaining information at issue is general administrative and purely factual information. Thus, we find you have failed to show the remaining information at issue consists of advice, opinions, or recommendations on the policymaking matters of the city. Accordingly, the remaining information at issue may not be withheld under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold Exhibit F under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with federal law. The city may withhold Exhibit B under section 552.107 of the Government Code and the information we have marked in Exhibit C under section 552.111 of the Government Code. 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,



Paige Lay  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

PL/som

Ref: ID# 637556

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)