



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 3, 2016

Ms. Jennifer Scholl
Counsel for the Wells Branch Municipal District
Armbrust & Brown, PLLC
100 Congress Avenue, Suite 1300
Austin, Texas 78701-2744

OR2016-17498

Dear Ms. Scholl:

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# 621147.

The Wells Branch Municipal Utility District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for nine categories of information pertaining to utility fee assessments for a specified school district. You claim 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 information.

Initially, we note the information we have marked is not responsive to the instant request for information because it was created after the request was received by the district. This ruling does not address the public availability of non-responsive information, and the district is not required to release non-responsive 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 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)(A), (B), (C), (D), (E). 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).

The district states Exhibit B-1 consists of communications involving district attorneys, district representatives, and other district employees and officials. The district also explains some of the communications at issue are between district attorneys and Crossroads Utility Services, LLC (“Crossroads”), a privileged party. The district states the communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the district and these communications have remained confidential. Upon review, we find the district has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Therefore, the district may generally withhold Exhibit B-1 under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. However, we note some of these e-mail strings include e-mails and attachments received from or sent to non-privileged parties. Furthermore, if these e-mails and attachments are removed from the e-mail strings and stand alone, they are responsive to the request for information. Therefore, to the extent the district maintains these non-privileged e-mails and attachments, which we have marked, separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, the district may not withhold these non-privileged e-mails and attachments 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, 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 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. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152, 157 (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, section 552.111 protects the factual information. 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 which the governmental body establishes it has a privity of interest or common deliberative process. 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.

The district states Exhibit B-2 consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations relating to the district's policymaking. Further, the district informs us some of the communications at issue involve Crossroads with which the district states it shares a privity of interest. Upon review, we find the district may withhold some of the information at issue, which we have marked, under section 552.111. However, we find the district has failed to demonstrate it shares a privity of interest or common deliberative process with some of the individuals in the remaining communications. Further, some of the remaining information at issue consists of either general administrative information that does not relate to policymaking or information that is purely factual in nature. Thus, we find the district has failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue is excepted under section 552.111. Accordingly, the district may not withhold the remaining information at issue under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

In summary, the district may generally withhold Exhibit B-1 under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. However, to the extent the district maintains the non-privileged e-mails and attachments we marked separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then the district may not withhold these non-privileged e-mails and

attachments under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The district may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.

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 http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Katelyn Blackburn-Rader". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Katelyn" being more prominent.

Katelyn Blackburn-Rader
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KB-R/bw

Ref: ID# 621147

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)