April 15, 2020

Ms. Amy Bass-Domel
Open Records
Williamson County Sheriff’s Office
508 South Rock Street
Georgetown, Texas 78626

Dear Ms. Bass-Domel:

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# 822508.

The Williamson County Sheriff’s Office (the “sheriff’s office”) received a request for all correspondence between the sheriff’s office and a named entity during a defined time period. You state the sheriff’s office will rely on Open Records Letter No. 2019-31151 (2019) and withhold or release some of the requested information in accordance with that ruling. You claim some of the submitted information is not subject to the Act. Additionally, you claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.107, 552.111, 552.117, 552.1175, 552.137, and 552.152 of the Government Code. You also state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of Big Fish Entertainment (“Big Fish”). Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified Big Fish of the request for information and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information at issue should not be released. See Gov’t Code § 552.305(d); see also Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in the Act in certain

1 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).
circumstances). We have received comments from Big Fish. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.\(^2\)

Initially, you state the submitted information contains usernames and passwords used by sheriff’s office employees to access law enforcement records. Section 552.002(a) of the Government Code defines “public information” as information that is written, produced, collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business:

1. by a governmental body;

2. for a governmental body and the governmental body:
   a. owns the information;
   b. has a right of access to the information; or
   c. spends or contributes public money for the purpose of writing, producing, collecting, assembling, or maintaining the information; or

3. by an individual officer or employee of a governmental body in the officer’s or employee’s official capacity and the information pertains to official business of the governmental body.

Gov’t Code § 552.002(a). In Open Records Decision No. 581 (1990), this office determined certain computer information, such as source codes, documentation information, and other computer programming, that has no significance other than its use as a tool for the maintenance, manipulation, or protection of public property is not the kind of information made public under section 552.021 of the Government Code. Further, you state the logins and passwords are used only to access records and have no significance other than their use as tools for the maintenance, manipulation, or protection of public information. Based on your representations and our review, we find this information does not constitute public information under section 552.002 of the Government Code. Therefore, we conclude the logins and passwords you indicated are not subject to the Act and need not be released to the requestor.

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. 2

\(^2\) 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.
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 responsive information consists of communications between attorneys for the sheriff’s office, a representative of the attorneys for the sheriff’s office, and sheriff’s office employees that were made for the purpose of providing legal services to the sheriff’s office. You indicate the communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find most of the responsive information consists of privileged attorney-client communications the sheriff’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 we marked, are maintained by the sheriff’s office separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then the sheriff’s office may not withhold these non-privileged e-mails under section 552.107(1). Additionally, we note some of the information was shared with individuals whom you have

3 As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.
not demonstrated to be privileged parties. Therefore, you have failed to establish how the information at issue constitutes privileged attorney-client communications for the purposes of section 552.107(1). Furthermore, we note some of the information at issue consists of communications between the sheriff’s office and a third party regarding contract negotiations. Thus, the parties’ interests were adverse at the time of the communications. Therefore, we find the information we marked and indicated for release was shared with parties you have not shown to be privileged. Accordingly, the sheriff’s office 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 intragency 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 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 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 responsive information consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations of sheriff’s office employees and officials regarding policymaking matters. Although you claim section 552.111 for this information, we find you have failed to demonstrate the sheriff’s office shares a privity of interest with the named individuals in this instance. Additionally, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining responsive information pertains to policymaking matters of the sheriff’s office for the purposes section 552.111 of the Government Code. Therefore, we find the sheriff’s office has failed to demonstrate the remaining responsive information constitutes internal communications containing advice, recommendations, or opinions reflecting the policymaking processes of the sheriff’s office. Accordingly, the sheriff’s office may not withhold any of the remaining responsive information under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

In summary, with the exception of the information we marked and indicated for release, the sheriff’s office may generally withhold the submitted information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code; however, the sheriff’s office 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 sheriff’s office must release the remaining responsive 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/be

Ref: ID# 822508

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)