



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 21, 2020

Ms. Leslie Whitten
Assistant City Attorney
City of College Station
P.O. Box 9960
College Station, Texas 77842

OR2020-05611

Dear Ms. Whitten:

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# 812620 (File No. A19-001892; ORR No. 191122.3).

The City of College Station (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to (1) a particular development; (2) a particular address; (3) certain communications, reports, and analyses related to the development; and (4) information pertaining to the BioCorridor Planned Development District and certain categories of information related to the governing bodies of the BioCorridor. You state the city has released some information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.106, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information. We have also received and considered comments from a representative of the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Initially, the requestor argues the city failed to comply with section 552.301(b) of the Government Code. The requestor acknowledges the city timely submitted its initial briefing but asserts the city's invoking of sections 552.101 through 552.158 of the Government Code does not comply with the requirements of section 552.301(b). We note pursuant to section 552.301(b), a governmental body need only ask for a decision from this

¹ Although you also raise Texas Rule of Evidence 503, we note the proper exception to raise when asserting the attorney-client privilege for information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code is section 552.107 of the Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 677 (2002), 676 at 1-2 (2002).

office and *state* the exceptions that apply within ten business days. *Id.* § 552.301(b) (emphasis added). Upon review, we find the city complied with the procedural requirements mandated by section 552.301(b) of the Government Code. Accordingly, we will address the city's arguments against disclosure of the submitted information.

Next, we note the submitted information contains copies of a city ordinance. As laws and ordinances are binding on members of the public, they are matters of public record and may not be withheld from disclosure under the Act. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 551 at 2-3 (1990) (laws or ordinances are open records), 221 at 1 (1979) (official records of governmental body's public proceedings are among most open of records). Therefore, the submitted ordinance must be released.

Additionally, we note the remaining information contains the minutes of public meetings, agendas, and draft minutes of public meetings. Minutes and agendas of a governmental body's public meetings are specifically made public under the Open Meetings Act, chapter 551 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 551.022 (minutes and tape recordings of open meeting are public records and shall be available for public inspection and copying on request to governmental body's chief administrative officer or officer's designee). We note the minutes of a public meeting of a governmental body are public records when entered, are public in whatever form they exist, and public access may not be delayed until formal approval is obtained. Open Records Decision No. 225 (1979). Further, as a general rule, the exceptions to disclosure found in the Act, such as section 552.111, does not apply to information other statutes make public. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 623 at 3 (1994), 525 at 3 (1989). Therefore, the information at issue, which we have marked, must be released pursuant to chapter 551 of the Government Code.

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. Section 552.101 encompasses section 551.104 of the Government Code which provides, in part, "[t]he certified agenda or tape of a closed meeting is available for public inspection and copying only under a court order issued under Subsection (b)(3)." Gov't Code § 551.104(c). Thus, such information cannot be released to a member of the public in response to an open records request. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-995 at 5-6 (1988) (public disclosure of certified agenda of closed meeting may be accomplished only under procedures provided in Open Meetings Act). Section 551.146 of the Open Meetings Act makes it a criminal offense to disclose a certified agenda or tape recording of a lawfully closed meeting to a member of the public. *See* Gov't Code § 551.146(a)-(b); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 495 at 4 (1998). Likewise, this office has determined minutes of a closed meeting are confidential. *See* Open Records Decision No. 60 (1974) (closed meeting minutes are confidential under predecessor to section 551.104); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 563 (1990) (minutes of properly held executive session are confidential under Open Meetings Act), 495 (information protected under predecessor to section 551.104 cannot be released to member of public in response to open records request). We note a portion of the remaining information consists of the written minutes of a closed meeting. Upon review, we find the city must withhold the information we have

marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 551.104 of the Government Code.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 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* ORD 676 at 6-7. 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.*, 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 in Exhibit 2 consists of privileged attorney-client communications that were made for the purpose of providing legal services to the city. You state the communications were between privileged parties, were intended to be confidential, and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find Exhibit 2 consists of privileged attorney-client communications. Therefore, the city may withhold Exhibit 2 under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

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

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 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 =

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.

You state the remaining information in Exhibit C consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations of city employees and officials, as well as City of Bryan employees, who you state share a privity of interest with the city in regard to the policymaking matters at issue. Upon review, we find the city may withhold the information we have marked and

indicated under section 552.111 of the Government Code.³ However, we find the remaining information at issue consists of either general administrative information that does not relate to policymaking, information that is purely factual in nature, or information that reflects communications with parties with whom the city has not demonstrated it shares a privity of interest. Thus, you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information reveals advice, opinions, or recommendations that pertain to policymaking. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information at issue under section 552.111 of the Government Code on the basis of the deliberative process privilege.

Section 552.106 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[a] draft or working paper involved in the preparation of proposed legislation.” Gov’t Code § 552.106(a). Section 552.106(a) ordinarily applies only to persons with a responsibility to prepare information and proposals for a legislative body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 460 at 1 (1987). The purpose of this exception is to encourage frank discussion on policy matters between the subordinates or advisors of a legislative body and the members of the legislative body; therefore, section 552.106 encompasses only policy judgments, recommendations, and proposals involved in the preparation of proposed legislation and does not except purely factual information from public disclosure. *Id.* at 2. We note sections 552.106 and 552.111 are similar in that they both protect advice, opinion, and recommendation on policy matters in order to encourage frank discussion during the policymaking process. *Id.* at 3. However, section 552.106 is narrower than section 552.111 in that it applies specifically to the legislative process. *Id.*

You argue the remaining information is protected by section 552.106 of the Government Code. Upon review, we find you failed to demonstrate the information at issue constitutes recommendations, opinions, or advice for purposes of section 552.106. We therefore conclude the city may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.106 of the Government Code.

In summary, the submitted ordinance must be released. The minutes of public meetings, agendas, and draft minutes of public meetings we have marked must be released pursuant to chapter 551 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the written minutes of a closed meeting we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 551.104 of the Government Code. The city may withhold Exhibit 2 under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The city may withhold the information we have marked and indicated under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The city 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.

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

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Erin Groff". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Erin" written in a larger, more prominent script than the last name "Groff".

Erin Groff
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

EMG/jxd

Ref: ID# 812620

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)