



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 18, 2019

Ms. Alix Morris
Deputy General Counsel
Office of the Lieutenant Governor
P. O. Box 12068
Austin, Texas 78711

OR2019-10427

Dear Ms. Morris:

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# 760195.

The Office of the Lieutenant Governor (the "lieutenant governor's office") received a request for ten categories of information pertaining to legislation and air pollution during a specified time period.¹ You state the lieutenant governor's office will release some information. You state the lieutenant governor's office has withheld some information pursuant to section 306.004 of the Government Code and pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684.²

¹We note the lieutenant governor's office sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also* *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding when governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification of unclear or overbroad request for public information, ten-business-day period to request attorney general opinion is measured from date request is clarified or narrowed). Additionally, you inform us the requestor was required to make a deposit for payment of anticipated costs for the request under section 552.263 of the Government Code, which the lieutenant governor's office received on January 30, 2019. *See* Gov't Code § 552.263(e) (if governmental body requires deposit or bond for anticipated costs pursuant to section 552.263, request for information is considered to have been received on date that governmental body receives deposit or bond).

²Release of information subject to section 306.004(a) of the Government Code is governed by chapter 306, not the Act, and it is within the discretion of a legislator to either withhold or release such information. *See* Gov't Code § 306.004(a); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 648 at 3-7 (1996). Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information, including an e-mail address of a member of the public under section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general opinion.

You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.106, 552.107, 552.111, and 552.146 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.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. 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 Exhibit B consists of communications between attorneys for the Texas Legislative Council (“council”) and staff for the lieutenant governor’s office. You explain council attorneys provide legal research and counsel to the Lieutenant Governor and legislators. You

³We 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.

state the communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the lieutenant governor's office. You further state these communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to Exhibit B. Thus, the lieutenant governor's office may withhold Exhibit B under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.⁴

Section 552.146 of the Government Code provides, in relevant part:

(a) All written or otherwise recorded communications, including conversations, correspondence, and electronic communications, between a member of the legislature or the lieutenant governor and an assistant or employee of the Legislative Budget Board [the "board"] are excepted from [required public disclosure].

...

(c) This section does not except from required disclosure a record or memoranda of a communication that occurs in public during an open meeting or public hearing conducted by the [board].

Gov't Code § 552.146(a), (c). You state the information you marked consists of communications between employees of the board, the lieutenant governor's office, and members of the legislature or their staffs. You also state this information does not pertain to communications that occurred in open meetings or public hearings. Upon review, we conclude the lieutenant governor's office may withhold the information you marked under section 552.146 of the Government Code.⁵

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[.]" *Id.* § 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 your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

⁵As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

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 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 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 Nos. 631 at 2 (section 552.111 encompasses information created for governmental body by outside consultant acting at governmental body's request and performing task that is within governmental body's authority), 561 at 9 (1990) (section 552.111 encompasses communications with party with which governmental body has privity of interest or common deliberative process), 462 at 14 (1987) (section 552.111 applies to memoranda prepared by governmental body's consultants). 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 at 9.

You assert the information at issue consists of advice, recommendations, and opinions of the lieutenant governor's office's staff and representatives of other government entities with

whom the lieutenant governor's office shares a privity of interest regarding policymaking decisions. You also inform us portions of the information at issue include draft documents that reflect the deliberations of the lieutenant governor's office's staff. You state these draft documents were intended for release in their final form. Based on your representations and our review, we find the lieutenant governor's office may withhold the information you marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code.⁶

In summary, the lieutenant governor's office may withhold Exhibit B under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The lieutenant governor's office may withhold the information you marked under section 552.146 of the Government Code. The lieutenant governor's office may withhold the information you marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The lieutenant governor's office 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,



Kelly McWethy
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KSM/jxd

Ref: ID# 760195

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

⁶As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.