



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 17, 2017

Mr. W. Montgomery Meitler
Senior Counsel
Texas Education Agency
1701 North Congress Avenue
Austin, Texas 78701-1494

OR2017-03701

Dear Mr. Meitler:

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# 646340 (TEA PIR# 28542).

The Texas Education Agency (the "agency") received a request for communications involving named agency employees concerning specified terms during a specified time period. You state the agency will release some information to the requestor. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.106, 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

Section 552.106(a) of the Government Code protects a "draft or working paper involved in the preparation of proposed legislation[.]" Gov't Code § 552.106. Section 552.106 ordinarily applies only to persons with a responsibility to prepare information and proposals for a legislative body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 460 (1987). The purpose of section 552.106 is to encourage frank discussion on policy matters between the subordinates or advisors of a legislative body and the members of the legislative body, and therefore, section 552.106 does not except from disclosure purely factual information. *See id.* at 2.

¹We 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.

However, a comparison or analysis of factual information prepared to support proposed legislation is within the ambit of section 552.106. *See id.* A proposed budget constitutes a recommendation by its very nature and may be withheld under section 552.106. *See id.*; *see also Hooten v. Enriquez*, 863 S.W. 2d 522 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1993, no writ) (agencyer's court performs legislative function when it creates the budget for county's offices and departments).

You state the information you marked consists of communications between agency employees and staff members of legislators pertaining to drafts of proposed legislation. You explain, in the communications, agency employees analyzed drafts of proposed legislation and provided advice, recommendations, and opinions in the preparation of the proposed legislation. Upon review, we find the agency has demonstrated the information at issue constitutes policy judgments, recommendations, and proposals regarding proposed legislation related to the agency. Accordingly, the agency may withhold the information you marked under section 552.106 of the Government Code.

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).

You state the information you marked consists of communications between attorneys for the agency and agency staff and clients that were made for the purpose of providing legal services to the agency. You state the communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find the information you marked consists of privileged attorney-client communications the agency may generally withhold under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. We note, however, the otherwise privileged e-mail strings at issue include e-mails received from non-privileged parties. Furthermore, if the e-mails received from the non-privileged parties are removed from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear and stand alone, they are responsive to the request for information. Therefore, if the non-privileged e-mails, which we have marked, are maintained by the agency separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then the agency may not withhold these non-privileged e-mails 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).

You state the information you marked “reflects the internal deliberations of the commissioner and executive staff regarding policy issues and mission critical functions concerning the Performance-Based Monitoring Analysis System[.]” Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we find the agency has demonstrated the information you marked consists of advice, opinions, or recommendations on the policymaking matters of the agency. Thus, the agency may withhold the information you marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

In summary, the agency may withhold the information you marked under section 552.106 of the Government Code. The agency may generally withhold the information you marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code; however, if the non-privileged e-mails, which we have marked, are maintained by the agency separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then the agency may not withhold these non-privileged e-mails under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The agency may withhold the information you marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The agency must release the remaining 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,



Ian Lancaster
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

IML/sb

Ref: ID# 646340

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)