



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 24, 2020

Ms. Clara H. Saafir
Assistant District Attorney
Dallas County District Attorney's Office
411 Elm Street, 5th Floor
Dallas, Texas 75202-3317

OR2020-16498

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# 833334.

Dallas County (the "county") received a request for communications involving a named county employee related to a specified topic during a certain date range. You state the county will release some information to the requestor. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107 and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

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 of the instant request. This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the request and the county is not required to release such information in response to this request.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within 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

¹ 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.

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.* 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 you marked consists of confidential e-mail communications between county attorneys, employees, and officials that were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services. You also assert the communications were intended to be confidential and their confidentiality has been maintained. Upon review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Thus, the county may generally withhold the information you marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. However, we note the information you marked includes an e-mail attachment shared with a non-privileged party. Furthermore, if this attachment is removed from the information and stands alone, it is responsive to the request for information. Therefore, if the county maintains this non-privileged attachment, which we marked, separate and apart from the otherwise privileged communications, then the county may not withhold this attachment 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.

A portion of the remaining responsive information may be subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code.² Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code applies to records a governmental body holds in an employment capacity and excepts from public disclosure the current and former home addresses and telephone numbers, emergency contact information, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who request that 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 is 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.

Upon review, we conclude, to the extent the individuals at issue are currently or were formerly employed by the county and timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the county must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the county may only withhold the marked cellular telephone numbers if a governmental body did not pay for the cellular telephone service. Conversely, to the extent the individuals were never employed by the county or if the individuals at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024, the county may not withhold this information under section 552.117(a)(1).

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). Accordingly, the county must withhold the e-mail addresses we marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure.

² The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987)*.

In summary, the county may generally withhold the information you marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. However, if the county maintains the non-privileged attachment, which we marked, separate and apart from the otherwise privileged communications, the county may not withhold this attachment under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. 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 individuals at issue are currently or were formerly employed by the county and timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the county must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the county may only withhold the marked cellular telephone numbers if a governmental body did not pay for the cellular telephone service. The county must withhold the e-mail addresses we marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure. The county must release the remaining responsive 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,

Deborah Southerland
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

DS/jxd

Ref: ID# 833334

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)