



KEN PAXTON  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 6, 2016

Mr. Dustin Chapman  
County Administrator/Legal Counsel  
County of McLennan  
P.O. Box 1728  
Waco, Texas 76703-1728

OR2016-22494

Dear Mr. Chapman:

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# 630090.

The McLennan County Judge's Office and Information Technology Department (collectively, the "county") received a request for information related to Sentinel Cyber Intelligence ("Sentinel"). You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107, 552.111, and 552.139 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

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

---

<sup>1</sup>Although you also raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 552.107 of the Government Code, this office has concluded section 552.101 does not encompass other exceptions found in the Act. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 1-2 (2002), 575 at 2 (1990). Accordingly, we do not address your argument under section 552.101.

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).

You state the information submitted as Exhibit B consists of communications involving attorneys for the county and county employees and officials in their capacities as clients. You state these communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the county. 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 submitted information. Accordingly, the county may withhold Exhibit B 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 (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).

This office has also concluded a preliminary draft of a document that is intended for public release in its final form necessarily represents the drafter's advice, opinion, and recommendation with regard to the form and content of the final document, so as to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.111. *See* Open Records Decision No. 559 at 2 (1990) (applying statutory predecessor). Section 552.111 protects factual information in the draft that also will be included in the final version of the document. *See id.* at 2-3. Thus, section 552.111 encompasses the entire contents, including comments, underlining, deletions, and proofreading marks, of a preliminary draft of a policymaking document that will be released to the public in its final form. *See id.* at 2.

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 the remaining information submitted as Exhibit C consists of drafts of policymaking documents and communications relating to the county's efforts to assess and

address its network security systems. The submitted documentation reveals Sentinel is a consultant hired by the county to aid in these matters. Thus, we understand the county and Sentinel share a privity of interest with respect to the information at issue. You indicate the information at issue consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations of the county pertaining to the policymaking functions of the county. We note the information includes drafts of documents. However, you do not inform us whether the draft documents at issue will be made available to the public in their final forms. Upon review, we find the county has demonstrated portions of the remaining information, which we have marked, consist of advice, opinions, or recommendations on the policymaking matters of the county. Thus, the county may withhold the information we marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> However, if the submitted draft documents will be released in their final forms, then the county may withhold the entireties of the draft documents under section 552.111 of the Government Code. If the draft documents at issue are not intended for release in their final forms, then the county may not withhold the documents in their entireties under section 552.111. Upon review, however, we find the remaining information at issue is general administrative and purely factual information or does not pertain to policymaking. Thus, we find the remaining information at issue does not consist of internal communications containing advice, opinions, or recommendations on the policymaking matters of the county. Accordingly, the county may not withhold the remaining information at issue under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Section 552.139 of the Government Code provides, in relevant part:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information that relates to computer network security, to restricted information under Section 2059.055 [of the Government Code], or to the design, operation, or defense of a computer network.

(b) The following information is confidential:

(1) a computer network vulnerability report;

(2) any other assessment of the extent to which data processing operations, a computer, a computer program, network, system, or system interface, or software of a governmental body or of a contractor of a governmental body is vulnerable to unauthorized access or harm, including an assessment of the extent to which the governmental body's or contractor's electronically stored information containing sensitive or critical information is vulnerable to alteration, damage, erasure, or inappropriate use[.]

---

<sup>2</sup>As our ruling is dispositive for this information, we need not address your remaining argument against its disclosure.

Gov't Code § 552.139(a), (b)(1)-(2). Section 2059.055 of the Government Code provides, in pertinent part:

(b) Network security information is confidential under this section if the information is:

(1) related to passwords, personal identification numbers, access codes, encryption, or other components of the security system of a state agency;

(2) collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental entity to prevent, detect, or investigate criminal activity; or

(3) related to an assessment, made by or for a governmental entity or maintained by a governmental entity, of the vulnerability of a network to criminal activity.

*Id.* § 2059.055(b). You argue the remaining information submitted as Exhibit C relates to steps to be taken to assess the county's computer network security; the design, operation, and defense of the county's computer system; and the security of confidential and sensitive information. Based on your arguments and our review of the information, we find some of the remaining information, which we have marked, relates to computer network security, and the design, operation, or defense of the county's computer network. Accordingly, the county must withhold the information we marked under section 552.139 of the Government Code. However, you have not demonstrated the remaining information relates to the specifics of the county's computer network security, or to the design, operation, or defense of the county's computer network as contemplated in section 552.139(a). Further, you have not demonstrated the remaining information consists of a computer network vulnerability report or assessment as contemplated by section 552.139(b). Accordingly, the county may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.139 of the Government Code.

We note some of the materials at issue may be protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; see Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit.

In summary, the county may withhold Exhibit B under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The county may withhold the information we marked within Exhibit C under section 552.111 of the Government Code; however, if the draft documents will be released in their final forms, then the county may withhold the entireties of the submitted draft

documents under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The county must withhold the information we marked under section 552.139 of the Government Code. The county must release the remaining information; however, any information that is subject to copyright may be released only in accordance with copyright law.

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](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,



Claire V. Morris Sloan  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CVMS/som

Ref: ID# 630090

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)