



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 18, 2017

Mr. Gary Grief
Executive Director
Texas Lottery Commission
P.O. Box 16630
Austin, Texas 78761-6630

OR2017-21302

Dear Mr. Grief:

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# 673832 (TLC File# L-22783).

The Texas Lottery Commission (the "commission") received a request for communications pertaining to six specified bills. The commission claims 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 claimed exceptions 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 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 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 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 submitted information consists of communications involving attorneys for the commission and commission employees and officials that were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services. The commission also states these communications were intended to be, and have remained, confidential. Based on the commissions representations and our review, we find the commission has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information it marked. Thus, the commission may generally withhold the information it marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.¹ We note, however, some of these e-mail strings include e-mails received from or sent to non-privileged parties. Furthermore, if the e-mails received from or sent to non-privileged parties are removed from the e-mail strings and stand alone, they are responsive to the request for information. Therefore, if these non-privileged e-mails, which we have marked, are maintained by the commission separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then the commission may not withhold these non-privileged e-mails under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.106 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[a] draft or working paper involved in the preparation of proposed legislation” and “[a]n internal bill analysis or working paper prepared by the governor’s office for the purpose of evaluating proposed legislation.” Gov’t Code § 552.106(a)-(b). The purpose of section 552.106 is to encourage frank discussion on policy matters between the subordinates or advisors of a legislative body

¹As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the commission’s remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

and the members of the legislative body. See Open Records Decision No. 615 at 2 (1993). Therefore, section 552.106 is applicable only to the policy judgments, recommendations, and proposals of persons who are involved in the preparation of proposed legislation and who have an official responsibility to provide such information to members of the legislative body. See *id.* at 1; see also Open Records Decision No. 429 at 5 (1985) (statutory predecessor to section 552.106 not applicable to information relating to governmental entity's efforts to persuade other governmental entities to enact particular ordinances).

The commission states some of the remaining information, which it marked, "consists of internal staff communications and communications between [the commission], legislators' office, and the [g]overnor's office regarding the development, analysis[,] and evaluation of proposed legislation related to [the commission] and the lottery and bingo industry." The commission further states the information at issue "reflects policy judgments, advice, opinions[,] and recommendations related to possible draft legislation" and is protected under section 552.106(a). Upon review, we find the commission has established portions of the information at issue constitute advice, opinion, analysis, and recommendations regarding proposed legislation. Therefore, the commission may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.106 of the Government Code.² However, we find the commission has failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue constitutes advice, opinion, analysis, or recommendations for purposes of section 552.106. Accordingly, the commission may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.106.

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*

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the commission's remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

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).

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.

The commission states some of the remaining information, which it marked, consists of communications "relating to [the commission's] policymaking with regard to statutory mandates for the regulation and oversight of bingo and lottery games." Thus, the commission asserts the information at issue consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations of the commission pertaining to its policymaking functions. Based on the commission's representations and our review, we find the commission has demonstrated portions of the information at issue consist of advice, opinions, or recommendations on the policymaking matters of the commission. Accordingly, the commission may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, we find the remaining information at issue is general administrative and purely factual information or does not pertain to policymaking. Further, some of the remaining information was received from an individual with whom you have not demonstrated the commission shares a privity of interest or common deliberative process. Thus, we find you have failed to show how the remaining information at issue consists of internal communications containing advice, opinions, or recommendations on the policymaking matters of the commission. Accordingly, the commission may not withhold the remaining information at issue under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

In summary, the commission may generally withhold the information it 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 commission separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then the commission may not withhold these non-privileged e-mails under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The commission may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.106 of the Government Code. The commission may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The commission 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,



Gerald A. Arismendez
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

GAA/tdw

Ref: ID# 673832

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)