



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 20, 2020

Ms. Clara H. Saafir
Assistant District Attorney – Civil Division
Dallas County
411 Elm Street, 5th Floor
Dallas, Texas 75202

OR2020-11389

Dear Ms. Saafir:

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# 823240.

Dallas County (the “county”) received a request for specified test results and communications involving named county employees regarding specified topics during a certain date range.¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.² Initially, we note some of the submitted information, which we marked, is not responsive to the instant request for information because it was created after the date the county received the instant request for information. *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)*. This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that

¹ You state the county 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).

² 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.

is not responsive to the request and the county is not required to release such information in response to this request.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides in relevant part as follows:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

...

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). A governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show section 552.103(a) is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *See Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, orig. proceeding); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). A governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a). *See* ORD 551.

You argue a portion of the responsive information is protected by section 552.103 of the Government Code. Although you state an "ongoing dispute between the parties" existed on the date the county received the instant request for information, you have not provided this office with evidence any party had taken concrete steps toward litigation prior to the date the county received the request for information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e); Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982). Upon review, therefore, we find you have not established litigation was reasonably anticipated on the date the county received the request for information. Therefore, the county may not withhold any portion of the responsive information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

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). 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 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 Exhibit B consists of communications between attorneys for the county and county employees that were made for the purpose of providing legal services to the county. You indicate the communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find some of Exhibit B consists of privileged attorney-client communications the county may withhold under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. We note, however, some of these otherwise privileged 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 otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear and stand alone, they are responsive to the request for information. Therefore, if these non-privileged e-mails, which we 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). Additionally, we note some of the information at issue was shared with individuals whom you have not demonstrated to be privileged parties. Therefore, you have failed to establish how the information at issue, which we marked for release, constitutes privileged attorney-client communications for the purposes of section 552.107(1). Accordingly, the county may not withhold the information we marked for release 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, 364 (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 severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *See 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 Exhibit C consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations of county employees and third parties with whom the county shares a privity of interest regarding policymaking matters of the county. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated some of the information at issue consists of advice, opinions, or recommendations on the policymaking matters of the county. Accordingly, except for the information we marked for release, the county may withhold Exhibit C under section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, we find the remaining responsive information at issue is general administrative and purely factual information that does not rise to the level of policymaking or has been shared with individuals 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 constitutes internal communications containing advice, recommendations, or opinions reflecting the policymaking processes of the county. Therefore, the county may not withhold any of the remaining responsive information at issue under section 552.111 of the Government Code on the basis of the deliberative process privilege.

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the current and former home addresses and telephone numbers, emergency contact information, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former employees of a governmental body who request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code.³ Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). Section 552.117(a)(1) also applies to the personal cellular telephone number of a current or former official or employee of a governmental body, provided the cellular telephone service is not paid by a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-6 (1988). Whether a particular piece of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time the request for it is made. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Therefore, a governmental body must withhold information under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee only if the individual made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for this information was made. Accordingly, to the extent the individual whose cellular telephone number we marked timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code and the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body, the county must withhold the cellular telephone number we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. Conversely, to the extent the individual whose information is at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024, or the cellular telephone service is paid for by a governmental body, the county may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.117(a)(1).

In summary, with the exception of the information we marked for release, the county may withhold Exhibit B under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code; however, the county may not withhold the marked non-privileged e-mails if they are maintained separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear. Except for the information we marked for release, the county may withhold Exhibit C under section 552.111 of the Government Code. To the extent the individual whose cellular telephone number we marked timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code and the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body, the county must withhold the cellular telephone number we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The county must release the remaining responsive information.⁴

³ The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

⁴ In this instance, we note the information being released contains an e-mail address to which the requestor has a right of access under section 552.137(b) of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.137(b). However, Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009) is a previous determination authorizing all governmental bodies to withhold specific categories of information without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision, including e-mail addresses of members of the public under section 552.137 of the Government Code.

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,

Deborah Southerland
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

DS/eb

Ref: ID# 823240

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Thus, if the county receives another request for this same information from a person who does not have a right of access to it, Open Records Decision No. 684 authorizes the county to redact the requestor's e-mail address without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.