



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 23, 2019

Mr. Joseph Behnke
Assistant General Counsel
Office of the Governor of Texas
P. O. Box 12428
Austin, Texas 78711

OR2019-23671

Dear Mr. Behnke:

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# 782396.

The Office of the Governor (the "governor's office") received a request for certain governor's office communications during a defined time period containing thirteen key words.¹ You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.106, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. You also state you notified the Senate Committee on Criminal Justice; the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality; and the Texas House Committee on Land & Resource Management ("the house") of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released). We have received comments from the house. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental

¹ We note the 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).

² We 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 that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

body has the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. See 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 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). 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. See *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).

You state the information you marked consists of communications between governor’s office attorneys and governor’s office employees that were made for the purpose of providing legal services to the governor’s office. You indicate 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 governor’s office may generally withhold under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.³ We note, however, some of these otherwise privileged 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 otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear and stand alone, they are responsive to the request for information. Therefore, if these non-privileged e-mails, which you indicated, are maintained by the governor’s office separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then the governor’s office may not withhold these non-privileged e-mails under section 552.107(1). In that event, we address your remaining arguments against disclosure of the non-privileged e-mails.

³ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

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. 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) (commissioner’s court performs legislative function when it creates the budget for county’s offices and departments).

You assert the information you marked consists of communications between, and working papers created by, the governor’s office and third parties who share a privity of interest with the governor’s office. You state the information at issue is related to pending legislation during the 86th Legislature and contains confidential analysis and description of such legislation. You explain the communications contain policy judgments, internal discussion of the legislative process, and confidential analysis and descriptions of such legislation. Upon review, we find the governor’s office has demonstrated the information at issue constitutes policy judgments, recommendations, and proposals regarding proposed legislation. Accordingly, the governor’s office may withhold the information you marked under section 552.106 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. 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

⁴ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

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).


You seek to withhold the remaining information you marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. You state the information at issue consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations of employees and officials of the commission regarding policymaking matters. Upon review, we find the governor's office may withhold the remaining information you marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

In summary, the governor's office may generally withhold the information you marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code; however, if these non-privileged e-mails, which you indicated, are maintained by the governor's office separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then the governor's office may not withhold these non-privileged e-mails under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The governor's office may withhold the information you marked under section 552.106 of the Government Code. The governor's office may withhold the remaining information you marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The 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 <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open-government/members-public/what-expect-after-ruling-issued> or call the OAG's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Public Information Act may be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the OAG, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,


Ashley Crutchfield
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

AC/jxd

Mr. Joseph Behnke - Page 5

Ref: ID# 782396

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 4 Requestors
(w/o enclosures)