



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 5, 2020

Mr. Rashaad V. Gambrell
Assistant City Attorney
City of Houston
P.O. Box 368
Houston, Texas 77001

OR2020-15481

Dear Mr. Gambrell:

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# 832384 (GC No. 26583).

The City of Houston (the "city") received a request for e-mails from named city employees mentioning specified terms during a defined period of time.¹ You state you will make some of the responsive information available to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, 552.108, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

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

¹ The city states it 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 that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses information made confidential by other statutes, such as section 81.046 of the Health and Safety Code, which provides in part:

(a) Reports, records, and information received from any source, including from a federal agency or from another state, furnished to a public health district, a health authority, a local health department, or the [Texas Department of State Health Services] that relate to cases or suspected cases of diseases or health conditions are confidential and may be used only for the purposes of this chapter.

(b) Reports, records, and information relating to cases or suspected cases of diseases or health conditions are not public information under [the Act], and may not be released or made public on subpoena or otherwise except as provided by Subsections (c), (c-1), (d), and (f).

Health & Safety Code § 81.046(a), (b). In Open Records Decision No. 577 (1990), this office concluded any information acquired or created during an investigation under chapter 81 of the Health and Safety Code is confidential and may not be released unless an exception set out in the statute applies. *See* ORD 577; Health & Safety Code § 81.046(b)-(d), (f). We understand the information you indicated was created by or provided to the city during investigations under chapter 81 of the Health and Safety Code. Based on your representations and our review, we agree the information at issue is subject to section 81.046. You state you have not received consent from the individuals identified in the information at issue. We also understand the release provisions of section 81.046 are not applicable. Thus, the city must withhold the information you indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 81.046 of the Health and Safety Code.³

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information subject to the attorney-client privilege. 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

³ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

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 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 you indicated constitutes communications between attorneys for the city, attorney representatives, and city employees that were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the city. You further state the communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Based upon your representations and our review, we find the city has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to most of the information at issue. Accordingly, the city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.⁴ However, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue documents confidential communications between privileged parties. Thus, the remaining information at issue is not privileged, and the city may not withhold it under section 552.107(1) 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 reasonably 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(b)(1) is intended to protect “information which, if released, would permit private citizens to anticipate weaknesses in a police department, avoid detection, jeopardize officer safety, and generally undermine police efforts to effectuate the laws of this State.” *See City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320, 327 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.). This office has concluded section 552.108(b)(1) excepts from public disclosure information relating to the security or operation of a law enforcement agency. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 (release of detailed use of force guidelines would unduly interfere with law enforcement), 252 (1980) (section 552.108 of the Government Code is designed to protect investigative techniques and procedures used in law enforcement), 143 (1976)

⁴ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

(disclosure of specific operations or specialized equipment directly related to investigation or detection of crime may be excepted). Section 552.108(b)(1) is not applicable, however, to generally known policies and procedures. *See, e.g.*, ORD Nos. 531 at 2-3 (Penal Code provisions, common law rules, and constitutional limitations on use of force not protected), 252 at 3 (governmental body failed to indicate why investigative procedures and techniques requested were any different from those commonly known).

You assert portions of the remaining information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code. You state the information at issue consists of internal records of the Houston Police Department, release of which would interfere with law enforcement. Based upon your representations and our review, we conclude the release of some of the remaining information would interfere with law enforcement. Accordingly, the city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code.⁵ However, we find you have failed to demonstrate release of any of the remaining information would interfere with law enforcement or crime prevention. Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 418.177 of the Texas Homeland Security Act (the “HSA”), chapter 418 of the Government Code. Section 418.177 provides:

Information is confidential if the information

(1) is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental entity for the purpose of preventing, detecting, or investigating an act of terrorism or related criminal activity; and

(2) relates to an assessment by or for a governmental entity, or an assessment that is maintained by a governmental entity, of the risk or vulnerability of persons or property, including critical infrastructure, to an act of terrorism or related criminal activity.

Gov’t Code § 418.177. The fact that information may generally be related to emergency preparedness does not make the information *per se* confidential under the provisions of the HSA. *See* Open Records Decision No. 649 at 3 (1996). As with any confidentiality statute, a governmental body asserting section 418.177 must adequately explain how the responsive information falls within the scope of that provision. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must explain how claimed exception to disclosure applies).

Upon review, we find some of the remaining information, which we have marked, was collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental entity for the purpose of preventing, detecting, or investigating an act of terrorism and relates to an assessment of the risk or vulnerability of critical infrastructure to an act of terrorism. Accordingly, the

⁵ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.177 of the Government Code.⁶ However, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information is subject to 418.177 of the Government Code and it may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code on this basis.

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[.]” *Id.* § 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

⁶ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

the governmental body establishes it has a privity of interest or common deliberative process with the third party. *See* ORD 561. We note a governmental body does not share a privity of interest with a third party when the governmental body and the third party are involved in contract negotiations, as the parties' interests are adverse.

You seek to withhold the remaining information under section 552.111 of the Government Code. You state the information at issue consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations of city employees and third parties with whom the city shares a privity of interest or common deliberative process regarding policymaking matters of the city. Upon review, we find portions of the remaining information, which we marked, consists of advice, opinions, or recommendations on the policymaking matters of the city. Accordingly, the city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue consists of internal communications containing advice, opinions, or recommendations on the policymaking matters of the city. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure the home address, home telephone number, emergency contact information, and social security number of a peace officer, as well as information that reveals whether the peace officer has family members, regardless of whether the peace officer complies with sections 552.024 and 552.1175 of the Government Code.⁷ *See* Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(2). Section 552.117(a)(2) applies to peace officers as defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. We note section 552.117 also encompasses a personal cellular telephone number, unless the cellular service is paid for by a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-7 (1988) (statutory predecessor to section 552.117 not applicable to cellular telephone numbers provided and paid for by governmental body and intended for official use). Accordingly, to the extent the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body, the city must withhold the cellular telephone numbers we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code. Conversely, to the extent the cellular telephone service is paid for by a governmental body, the city may not withhold the cellular telephone numbers we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2) 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 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). As noted above, section 552.117 encompasses a personal cellular telephone number, unless the cellular service is paid for by a governmental body. *See* ORD 506 at 5-7. 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 who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the

⁷ The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

date of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. Therefore, to the extent the individuals whose information is at issue 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 city must withhold the cellular telephone numbers we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. Conversely, to the extent the individuals 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 city may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.117(a)(1) 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* Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail addresses at issue are not excluded by subsection (c). Therefore, the city must withhold the personal e-mail addresses we marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure.

In summary, the city must withhold the information you indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 81.046 of the Health and Safety Code. The city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.177 of the Government Code. The city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. To the extent the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body, the city must withhold the cellular telephone numbers we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code. To the extent the individuals whose information is at issue 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 city must withhold the cellular telephone numbers we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the personal e-mail addresses we marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure. 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,

Sean McCormick
Attorney
Open Records Division

SMC/jm

Ref: ID# 832384

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)