



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 24, 2022

Ms. Lizet Islas  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Houston  
P.O. Box 368  
Houston, Texas 77001-0368

OR2022-32784

Dear Ms. Islas:

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# 979561 (Ref. No. M000247-080222).

The City of Houston (the "city") received a request for a certain type of notice pertaining to a named individual and all communications between that named individual and two other named city officials during a stated period of time. You state the city will release some information to the requestor. You claim some of the submitted information is not subject to the Act. You also claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.106, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>1</sup>

Initially, we note some of the submitted information, which we have marked, is not responsive to the present request for information because it does not consist of communications during the time period specified in the present request. This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the request and the city is not required to release such information in response to the present request.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> As we are able to make this determination, we need not address your arguments against disclosure of this information.

Next, you assert some of the responsive information is not subject to the Act. The Act is applicable only to “public information.” *See* Gov’t Code §§ 552.002, .021. Section 552.002(a) defines “public information” as follows:

In this chapter, “public information” means information that is written, produced, collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business:

- (1) by a governmental body;
- (2) for a governmental body and the governmental body:
  - (A) owns the information;
  - (B) has a right of access to the information; or
  - (C) spends or contributes public money for the purpose of writing, producing, collecting, assembling, or maintaining the information; or
- (3) by an individual officer or employee of a governmental body in the officer’s or employee’s official capacity and the information pertains to official business of the governmental body.

*Id.* § 552.002(a). Section 552.002(a-1) also provides the following:

Information is in connection with the transaction of official business if the information is created by, transmitted to, received by, or maintained by an officer or employee of the governmental body in the officer’s or employee’s official capacity, or a person or entity performing official business or a governmental function on behalf of a governmental body, and pertains to official business of the governmental body.

*Id.* § 552.002(a-1). Thus, virtually all of the information in a governmental body’s physical possession constitutes public information and, thus, is subject to the Act. *Id.* § 552.002(a)(1); *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 549 at 4 (1990), 514 at 1-2 (1988). The Act also encompasses information that a governmental body does not physically possess, if the information is collected, assembled, or maintained for the governmental body, and the governmental body owns the information or has a right of access to it. Gov’t Code § 552.002(a)(2); *see* Open Records Decision No. 462 at 4 (1987). Further, information that is written, produced, collected, assembled, or maintained by an individual officer or employee of a governmental body in the officer’s or employee’s official capacity may be subject to disclosure under the Act if the information pertains to official business of the governmental body. Gov’t Code § 552.002(a)(3). Information is “in connection with the transaction of official business” if it is created by, transmitted to, received by, or maintained

by a person or entity performing official business or a government function on behalf of a governmental body and it pertains to official business of the governmental body. *See id.* § 552.002(a-1). Moreover, section 552.001 of the Act provides it is the policy of this state that each person is entitled, unless otherwise expressly provided by law, to complete information about the affairs of government and the official acts of public officials and employees. *See id.* § 552.001(a).

We further note the characterization of information as “public information” under the Act is not dependent on whether the requested records are in the possession of an individual or whether a governmental body has a particular policy or procedure that establishes a governmental body’s access to the information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 635 at 3-4 (1995) (finding that information does not fall outside definition of “public information” in Act merely because individual member of governmental body possesses information rather than governmental body as whole); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 425 (1985) (concluding, among other things, that information sent to individual school trustees’ homes was public information because it related to official business of governmental body) (overruled on other grounds by Open Records Decision No. 439 (1986)). Thus, if the information at issue is related to the city’s business, the mere fact it is not in the city’s possession does not remove the information from the scope of the Act. *See* ORD 635 at 6-8 (stating that information maintained on a privately owned medium and actually used in connection with the transaction of official business would be subject to the Act).

You assert some of the responsive information consists of communications that solely relate to personal matters of city officials, and argue this information does not constitute public information since the nature of these communications does not pertain to the transaction of official business of the city. Further, you inform us the city has a policy that allows for incidental use of e-mail and work telephones, and you state the use of resources to create the information at issue was *de minimis*. *See* ORD 635 at 7 (section 552.002 not applicable to personal information unrelated to official business and created or maintained by state employee involving *de minimis* use of state resources). Upon review, we find the information you marked and indicated does not constitute “information that is written, produced, collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business” by or for the city. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.021. Thus, we conclude the responsive information you marked and indicated is not subject to the Act and need not be released in response to this request.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. *See id.* § 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 assert the information you indicated consists of privileged communications between city attorneys and city officials and employees in their capacities as clients. You state these communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the city. Further, you state these communications were intended to be, and have remained, confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Accordingly, the city may withhold the information you indicated under section 552.107 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).

You state the information you indicated consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations of city officials and employees regarding policymaking matters of the city. Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we find you have demonstrated some of the information at issue, which we have marked, consists of advice, opinions, or recommendations on the policymaking matters of the city. Accordingly, the city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup> However, we find the remaining information at issue is general administrative and purely factual that does not rise to the level of policymaking. Thus, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue constitutes internal communications containing advice, recommendations, or opinions reflecting the policymaking processes of the city. Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining responsive information under section 552.111 of the Government Code on the basis of the deliberative process privilege.

Section 552.106 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[a] draft or working paper involved in the preparation of proposed legislation.” Gov’t Code § 552.106(a). Section 552.106(a) ordinarily applies only to persons with a responsibility to prepare information and proposals for a legislative body. See Open Records Decision No. 460 at 1 (1987). The purpose of this exception is to encourage frank discussion on policy matters between the subordinates or advisors of a legislative body and the members of the legislative body; therefore, section 552.106 encompasses only policy judgments, recommendations, and proposals involved in the preparation of proposed legislation and does not except purely factual information from public disclosure. *Id.* at 2. We note sections 552.106 and 552.111 are similar in that they both protect advice, opinion, and recommendation on policy matters in order to encourage frank discussion during the policymaking process. *Id.* at 3. However, section 552.106 is narrower than section 552.111 in that it applies specifically to the legislative process. *Id.*

---

<sup>3</sup> As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

You assert some of the remaining responsive information is protected by section 552.106 of the Government Code. Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate the information at issue constitutes recommendations, opinions, or advice for purposes of section 552.106. Therefore, we conclude the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining responsive information under section 552.106 of the Government Code.

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. This section 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).

Upon review, we find some of the remaining information at issue satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining responsive information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, as the responsive information you marked and indicated is not subject to the Act, the city need not release it in response to this request. The city: (1) may withhold the information you indicated under section 552.107 of the Government Code; (2) may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code; (3) must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy; and (4) 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,

Blake Brennan  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

BBX/pt

Ref: ID# 979561

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)