



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 18, 2020

Ms. Megan R. Santee
Denton, Navarro, Rocha, Bernal & Zech, P. C.
Counsel for the City of Pflugerville
2500 West William Cannon Drive, Suite 609
Austin, Texas 78745-5320

OR2020-08501

Dear Ms. Santee:

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# 816900 (City ID No. W008807-090519).

The City of Pflugerville (the “city”), which you represent, received a request for all communications between nine named entities pertaining to a specified development during a defined time period.¹ You state the city will release some of the requested information. You state the city will rely on Open Records Letter No. 2019-24209 (2019) and withhold some of the requested information in accordance with that ruling.² You claim 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 information.

¹ We note the city sought and received clarification of the information requested in response to cost estimates provided to the requestor under section 552.2615 of the Government Code. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request), .2615; *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 *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (so long as law, facts, and circumstances on which prior ruling was based have not changed, first type of previous determination exists where requested information is precisely same information as was addressed in prior attorney general ruling, ruling is addressed to same governmental body, and ruling concludes that information is or is not excepted from disclosure).

Initially, you state some of the submitted information is not responsive to the present request because it does not pertain to any of the information requested by the requestor. This ruling does not address the public availability of the non-responsive information and the city need not release it in response to this request.

Next, we note the submitted information includes draft minutes of a meeting of the city council. The minutes of a governmental body's public meetings are specifically made public under provisions of 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). In this instance, the submitted minutes are draft minutes. 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). Accordingly, section 551.022 is applicable to the draft minutes. Although you raise sections 552.106, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code as exceptions to disclosure of this information, we note that as a general rule, the exceptions to disclosure found in the Act are not applicable to information that other statutes make public. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 623 at 3 (1994), 525 at 3 (1989). Therefore, the draft minutes may not be withheld under section 552.106, section 552.107, or section 552.111 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. *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 remaining information consists of communications between attorneys for the city and city employee that were made for the purpose of providing legal services to the city. You indicate the communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find the remaining information consists of privileged attorney-client communications the city 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 we marked, are maintained by the city separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then the city may not withhold these non-privileged e-mails under section 552.107(1). Additionally, we note some of the remaining information was shared with an individual, whom you have not demonstrated to be a privileged party. Therefore, you have failed to establish how the information at issue, which we marked for release, constitute a privileged attorney-client communication for the purposes of section 552.107(1). Accordingly, the city may not withhold the information at issue 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

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

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).

You seek to withhold the remaining information under section 552.111 of the Government Code. You state the remaining information consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations of employees of the city regarding policymaking matters. Upon review, however, we find the remaining information was shared with a third party with whom the city has not demonstrated 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 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” 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). We note section 552.106(b) applies to information created or used by employees of the governor's office for the purpose of evaluating proposed legislation. 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. *See* ORD 615 at 2. Therefore, section 552.106 is applicable only to the policy judgments, recommendations, and proposals of persons who are involved in the preparation or evaluation 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).

You inform us that the remaining information consists of communications among city employees and attorneys for the city pertaining to an ongoing city project. Upon review, however, we find the city has failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information constitutes recommendations, opinions, or advice for purposes of section 552.106. We therefore conclude the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.106 of the Government Code.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body” unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail

address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c).⁴ Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail address at issue is not a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c) of the Government Code. Accordingly, the city must withhold the e-mail address we marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner of the e-mail address affirmatively consents to its disclosure.

In summary, the city must release the draft meeting minutes pursuant to section 551.022 of the Government Code. With the exception of the information we marked for release, the city may generally withhold the remaining information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code; however, the city may not withhold the marked non-privileged e-mails if they are maintained separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear. The city must withhold the e-mail address we marked, unless the owner of the e-mail address affirmatively consents to its disclosure. 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.

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

Ref: ID# 816900

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

⁴ The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. See Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).