



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 27, 2017

Ms. Elizabeth Reynolds
Paralegal
Office of the City Attorney
City of Dallas
1500 Marilla Street, Room 7DN
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2017-26878

Dear Ms. Reynolds:

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# 684914 (ORR Nos. C006770, C006846, C006849, C006891, C006900, C006926, C006928, C006982, C006987, C007016, C007018, C007033, C007034, C007044, C007053, C007082, C007088, C007251, C007277, C007309, C007312, & C008220).

The City of Dallas (the "city") received twenty-two requests from twenty-one different requestors for information related to the removal of a specified statue.¹ One requestor additionally seeks information related to real estate transactions during a specified time period and information related to a specified parcel of land. The city states it will release some of the requested information. The city claims some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, 552.111, 552.117,

¹The city states it received clarification of some 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).

552.136, and 552.137 of the Government Code.² We have considered the exceptions the city claims and reviewed the submitted representative samples of information.³

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).

²The city informs us it withdraws its request for a ruling with respect to one of the requests at issue because the requestor narrowed the request at issue and the city released the information subject to the more narrowly tailored request.

³We 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.

The city states the information we marked Exhibits B-1 and B-2, and the portions of the information the city marked within the information we marked Exhibits C-2 and C-3, consists of communications involving attorneys for the city and city employees and officials in their capacities as clients. The city states these communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the city. The city states these communications were intended to be, and have remained, confidential. Based on these representations and our review, we find the city has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Accordingly, the city may withhold Exhibits B-1 and B-2 and the information the city marked within Exhibits C-2 and C-3 under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.⁴

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

⁴As our ruling is dispositive for this information, we need not address the city’s arguments under sections 552.103 and 552.111 of the Government Code against its disclosure.

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.

The city states some of the remaining information, which it marked within Exhibit C-2, consists of a draft of a policymaking document. The city informs us the document at issue will be made available to the public in its final form. Based on these representations and our review of the information at issue, we find the city may withhold the information the city marked within Exhibit C-2 under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the common-law physical safety exception. The Texas Supreme Court has recognized a separate common-law physical safety exception to required disclosure. *Tex. Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Cox Tex. Newspapers, L.P. & Hearst Newspapers, L.L.C.*, 343 S.W.3d 112, 118 (Tex. 2011). Pursuant to this common-law physical safety exception, "information may be withheld [from public release] if disclosure would create a substantial threat of physical harm." *Id.* In applying this new standard, the court noted "deference must be afforded" law enforcement experts regarding the probability of harm, but further cautioned, "vague assertions of risk will not carry the day." *Id.* at 119.

The city argues some of the remaining information, which it marked, is excepted under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law physical safety exception. The city contends "[i]n light of the fear, panic, and threats of physical harm that have taken place as a result of the removal of the" specified statue, the information the city marked must be withheld to protect the employees of crane companies, who "could face discrimination, harassment, and physical harm." Additionally, the city states crane company employees have personally received threats of physical harm connected to the work at issue. Upon review, we find the city has demonstrated the release of the identifying information of individual employees of crane companies, which we have marked, would create a substantial threat of physical harm. Thus, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law physical safety exception. However, we conclude the city has not demonstrated disclosure of the identifying information of the crane companies at issue would subject anyone to a specific

risk of harm. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law physical safety exception.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). We note common-law privacy protects the interests of individuals, not those of corporate and other business entities. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 620 (1993) (corporation has no right to privacy), 192 (1978) (right to privacy is designed primarily to protect human feelings and sensibilities, rather than property, business, or other pecuniary interests); *see also Rosen v. Matthews Constr. Co.*, 777 S.W.2d 434 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1989) (corporation has no right to privacy (citing *United States v. Morton Salt Co.*, 338 U.S. 632, 652 (1950))), *rev'd on other grounds*, 796 S.W.2d 692 (Tex. 1990). Upon review, we find the city has not demonstrated any of the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

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. Therefore, if the individual whose cellular telephone number the city marked within Exhibit C-2 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 information it marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. Conversely, if the individual 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 marked information 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"). This office has determined insurance policy numbers are access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. Accordingly, the city must withhold the routing and bank account numbers we marked and the insurance policy numbers the city 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). The city has marked e-mail addresses that it seeks to withhold under section 552.137. Upon review, we find the e-mail addresses at issue are excluded by subsection (c) or do not consist of the e-mail address of a member of the public. Therefore, the city may not withhold the personal e-mail addresses it marked 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 Exhibits B-1 and B-2 and the information the city marked within Exhibits C-2 and C-3 under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The city may withhold the information the city marked within Exhibit C-2 under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the names of the individual employees of crane companies we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law physical safety exception. If the individual whose cellular telephone number the city marked within Exhibit C-2 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 information it marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the routing and bank

account numbers we marked and the insurance policy numbers the city marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. 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, 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,



Claire V. Morris Sloan
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CVMS/som

Ref: ID# 684914

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 21 Requestors
(w/o enclosures)