



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 28, 2019

Mr. James Santangelo
Assistant City Attorney
City of Missouri City
1522 Texas Parkway
Missouri City, Texas 77489

OR2019-30338

Dear Mr. Santangelo:

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# 793490 (City ID# MCAG 19-28).

The City of Missouri City (the "city") received a request for nine categories of information pertaining to a named individual and a specified address. The city claims some of the submitted information is not subject to the Act. Additionally, the city claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, 552.108, and 552.111 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the city's arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

The city states some of the submitted information consists of information "either received by, or created to further compliance with a [g]rand [j]ury subpoena." The judiciary is expressly excluded from the requirements of the Act. Gov't Code § 552.003(1)(B). This office has determined for the purposes of the Act, a grand jury is a part of the judiciary and therefore not subject to the Act. *See* Open Records Decision No. 411 (1984). Furthermore, records kept by a governmental body that is acting as an agent for a grand jury are considered records in the constructive possession of the grand jury, and are also not subject to the Act. *See* Open Records Decisions Nos. 513 (1988), 411, 398 (1983). The fact that

¹ Although the city cites to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy for the submitted information, the city provides no arguments explaining how this doctrine applies to the information at issue. Therefore, we assume the city no longer asserts this doctrine. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302.

information collected or prepared by another person or entity is submitted to the grand jury does not necessarily mean such information is in the grand jury's constructive possession when the same information also is held in the other person's or entity's own capacity. Information held by another person or entity but not produced at the direction of the grand jury may well be protected under one of the Act's specific exceptions to disclosure, but such information is not excluded from the reach of the Act by the judiciary exclusion. *See* ORD 513. Thus, to the extent the city holds the information it marked solely as an agent of the grand jury, such information consists of records of the judiciary that are not subject to disclosure under the Act and the city is not required to release that information in response to the instant request. To the extent the city does not hold the information it marked solely as an agent of the grand jury, we will address the city's arguments against its disclosure.

Next, we note the submitted information contains draft minutes of a public meeting held by the city's Board of Adjustment (the "board"). The minutes of a governmental body's public meetings are specifically made public under provisions of the Open Meetings Act (the "OMA"), chapter 551 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 551.022 (minutes and tape recordings of open meeting are public records and shall be available for public inspection and copying on request to governmental body's chief administrative officer or officer's designee). We note the minutes of a public meeting of a governmental body are public records when entered, are public in whatever form they exist, and public access may not be delayed until formal approval is obtained. Open Records No. 225 (1979). Although the city seeks to withhold this information under section 552.111 of the Government Code, as a general rule, the exceptions to disclosure found in the Act do not apply to information that other statutes make public. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 623 at 3 (1994), 525 at 3 (1989). Accordingly, the city must release the draft meeting minutes pursuant to the OMA.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses article 20.02 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, which provides, "[t]he proceedings of the grand jury shall be secret." Crim. Proc. Code art. 20.02(a). In construing article 20.02 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, the types of "proceedings" Texas courts have generally stated are secret are testimony presented to the grand jury and the deliberations of the grand jury. *See In re Reed*, 227 S.W.3d 273, 276 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 2007, orig. proceeding). Upon review, we find the city has not explained how any of the information at issue reveals grand jury testimony or deliberations of the grand jury. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.101 in conjunction with article 20.02(a) of the Code of Criminal Procedure. *Cf.* Open Records Decision No. 513 at 4 (1988) (fact that information collected or prepared by another person or entity is submitted to grand jury does not necessarily mean that such information is confidential in possession of district attorney).

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 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). 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.*, 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).

The city states the information it marked consists of communications involving attorneys for the city and city employees and officials that were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services. The city states these communications were intended to be, and have remained, confidential. Based on the city’s 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 the information it marked 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.

The city states the information at issue consists of a draft of an agenda for a board meeting. The city indicates the final agenda will be made available to the public. Based on the city's representation and our review of the information at issue, we find the city may withhold the draft agenda it marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the internal records and notations of law enforcement agencies and prosecutors when their release would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. Gov't Code § 552.108(b)(1); see also Open Records Decision No. 531 at 2 (1989) (quoting *Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977)). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(b)(1) must explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. See Gov't Code §§ 552.108(b)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); see also *Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706. Section 552.108 may be invoked by the proper custodian of information relating to an investigation or prosecution of criminal conduct. See Open Records Decision No. 474 at 4-5 (1987). Where a governmental body has custody of information relating to a pending case of another law enforcement agency, the custodian of records may withhold the information if it provides this office with a demonstration the information relates to a

pending criminal case and a representation from the law enforcement agency that it wishes to have the information withheld. The city informs us the information it marked relates to an investigation being conducted by the Fort Bend County District Attorney's Office (the "district attorney's office"). However, the city has not provided a representation from the district attorney's office, nor has the district attorney's office provided a representation to this office, stating it wishes to withhold the information at issue. Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of the information it marked under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code.

In summary, to the extent the city holds the information it marked solely as an agent of the grand jury, such information consists of records of the judiciary that are not subject to disclosure under the Act and the city is not required to release that information in response to the instant request. The city must release the draft meeting minutes pursuant to the OMA. The city may withhold the information it marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The city may withhold the draft agenda it marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information.

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 <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open-government/members-public/what-expect-after-ruling-issued> or call the OAG's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Public Information Act may be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the OAG, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Gerald Arismendez
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

GAA/mo

Ref: ID# 793490

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)