



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

January 24, 2017

Ms. Julie Allen
Assistant General Counsel
Texas Alcoholic Beverage Commission
P. O. Box 13127
Austin, Texas 78711-3127

OR2017-01595

Dear Ms. Allen:

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# 642645 (TABC No. 1475780283).

The Texas Alcoholic Beverage Commission (the "commission") received a request for eleven categories of information.¹ You state you will release some of the requested information to the requestor. You claim portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, 552.108, 552.111, and 552.116 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

¹The commission states, and provides documentation showing, the requestor clarified his request, including a modification of the request to exclude third-party confidential and proprietary information. See Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (providing that if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify the 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 public information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

²We 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.

Initially, we note the commission has marked some of the submitted information as non-responsive to the instant request. This ruling does not address the public availability of non-responsive information, and the commission is not required to release such information in response to this request.

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 information made confidential by section 5.48 of the Alcoholic Beverage Code, which provides as follows:

(a) “Private records,” as used in this section, means all records of a permittee, licensee, or other person other than the name, proposed location, and type of permit or license sought in an application for an original or renewal permit or license, or in a periodic report relating to the importation, distribution, or sale of alcoholic beverages required by the commission to be regularly filed by a permittee or licensee.

(b) The private records of a permittee, licensee, or other person that are required or obtained by the commission or its agents, in connection with an investigation or otherwise, are privileged unless introduced in evidence in a hearing before the commission or before a court in this state or the United States.

Alco. Bev. Code § 5.48. The term “privileged” in this statute has been construed to mean “confidential” for purposes of the Act. Attorney General Opinion JM-1235 at 2 (1990); Open Records Decision Nos. 186 (1978), 62 (1974). Thus, section 5.48 makes confidential any records required or obtained by the commission, with the exception of “the name, proposed location, and type of permit or license sought in an application for an original or renewal permit or license” and “a periodic report relating to the importation, distribution, or sale of alcoholic beverages required by the commission to be regularly filed by a permittee or licensee.” Alco. Bev. Code § 5.48.

The commission states the information it marked consists of communications between a permittee, licensee, or applicant and the commission that concern an application, potential applications, renewal of a permit, or potential renewal of a permit. The commission states none of the information at issue has been introduced as evidence in a hearing before the commission or before a court in Texas or the United States. Based on the commission’s representations and our review, we agree the information at issue constitutes private records under section 5.48 of the Alcoholic Beverage Code. Accordingly, the commission must withhold the information it marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 5.48 of the Alcoholic Beverage Code.

Section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[a]n internal record or notation of a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that is maintained for internal use

in matters relating to law enforcement or prosecution . . . if . . . release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.108(b)(1); *see* Open Records Decision No. 531 at 2 (1989). 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.” *City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.). To demonstrate the applicability of this exception, a governmental body must meet its burden of explaining how and why release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. Open Records Decision No. 562 at 10 (1990). This office has concluded that section 552.108(b) 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 is designed to protect investigative techniques and procedures used in law enforcement), 143 (1976) (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.*, ORDs 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).

The commission explains the information it marked pertains to field operational methods of the commission’s law enforcement division and release of the information at issue would interfere with and be used to obstruct the commission’s ability to prosecute criminal activity. The commission also states release of this information would “subject assigned peace officers to substantial personal safety risks and undermine their ability to fulfil their law enforcement duties.” Upon review, we find the commission has demonstrated release of the information it at issue would interfere with law enforcement. Thus, the commission may withhold the information it marked under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code.³

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.

³As our ruling is dispositive, we do not address your remaining arguments against disclosure for the information at issue.

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 commission states the information it marked consists of communications between and among commission attorneys and employees made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of legal services. The commission also states these communications were intended to be, and have remained, confidential. Based on the commission’s representations and our review, we find the commission has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Thus, the commission may withhold the information you marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.⁴

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.*

⁴As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the Commission’s remaining argument against disclosure for the information at issue.

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.

The commission states the information it has marked consists of internal communications and draft documents pertaining to various topics resulting in commission-wide policymaking or legislative rulemaking. The commission informs us the draft documents have or will be released in their final forms. Based on these representations and our review of the information at issue, we find the commission has demonstrated some of the information at issue, which we have marked, consists of advice, opinions, or recommendations on the policymaking matters of the commission. Thus, the commission may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. 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 you have failed to show the remaining information at issue consists of advice, opinions, or recommendations on the policymaking matters of the commission. Accordingly, the remaining information the commission has marked may not be withheld under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Section 552.116 of the Government Code provides:

(a) An audit, working paper of an audit of the state auditor or the auditor of a state agency, an institution of higher education as defined by Section 61.003, Education Code, a county, a municipality, a school district, a hospital district, or a joint board operating under Section 22.074, Transportation Code, including any audit relating to the criminal history background check of a public school employee, is excepted from [required public disclosure]. If information in an audit working paper is also maintained in another record, that other record is not excepted from [public disclosure] by this section.

(b) In this section:

(1) "Audit" means an audit authorized or required by a statute of this state or the United States, the charter or an ordinance of a municipality, an order of the commissioners court of a county, the bylaws adopted by or other action of the governing board of a hospital district, a resolution or other action of a board of trustees of a school district, including an audit by the district relating to the criminal history background check of a public school employee, or a resolution or other action of a joint board described by Subsection (a) and includes an investigation.

(2) "Audit working paper" includes all information, documentary or otherwise, prepared or maintained in conducting an audit or preparing an audit report, including:

(A) intra-agency and interagency communications; and

(B) drafts of the audit report or portions of those drafts.

Gov't Code § 552.116(a), (b)(1)–(2). The commission seeks to withhold the information it has marked under section 552.116 of the Government Code. However, the purpose of section 552.116 is to protect the interests of the auditor, not the auditee. Here, the State Auditor's Office (the "SAO") is the auditor, and the information at issue is maintained by the commission, the auditee. As the auditee, the commission may not assert section 552.116 to protect its own interests in withholding information from disclosure. We note this office has received no arguments from the SAO seeking to withhold the information at issue under section 552.116 of the Government Code. Accordingly, none of the information the commission marked may be withheld under section 552.116 of the Government Code.

In summary, the commission must withhold the information it marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 5.48 of the Alcoholic Beverage Code.

The commission may withhold the information you marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The commission may withhold the information it marked under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code. The commission may withhold the information we have marked in under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The commission 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 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,



Kaelan A. Henze
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KAH/eb

Ref: ID# 642645

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

9 Third Parties
(w/o enclosures)