



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 23, 2020

Ms. Hadassah Schloss  
Director, Open Government  
Texas General Land Office  
P.O. Box 12873  
Austin, Texas 78711-2873

OR2020-29341

Dear Ms. Schloss:

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# 855107 (GLO ID#s 20-0479, 20-0482, and 20-0483).

The Texas General Land Office (the "GLO") received three requests from the same requestor for certain information pertaining to the requestor and the requestor's address. You state the GLO is withholding certain information pursuant to section 552.136(c) of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> You also state the GLO has released some information to the requestor. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107, 552.111, and 552.160 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>2</sup>

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. *See Gov't Code* § 552.107(1). 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> Section 552.136 of the Government Code permits a governmental body to withhold the information described in section 552.136(b) without the necessity of seeking a decision from this office. *See Gov't Code* § 552.136(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.136(e). *See id.* § 552.136(d), (e).

<sup>2</sup> 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 those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

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). 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. *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 assert the information you marked consists of privileged communications between attorneys for the GLO and GLO employees in their capacities as clients. You state these communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the GLO. Further, you state these communications were intended to be, and have remained, confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Accordingly, the GLO may withhold the information you marked under section 552.107 of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup>

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*

---

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

*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, 364 (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. *See 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 id.*

You assert the information you marked consists of advice, recommendations, and opinions of GLO staff and third parties with whom the GLO shares a privity of interest regarding

policymaking decisions of the GLO. You also inform us the information at issue includes draft documents that reflect the deliberations of the GLO's staff. You state these draft documents were intended for release in their final forms. Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we find you have demonstrated some of the information at issue, which we have marked, consists of advice, opinions, or recommendations on the policymaking matters of the GLO. Accordingly, the GLO may withhold the information we marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, we find the remaining information at issue is general administrative and purely factual that does not rise to the level of policymaking. Thus, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue constitutes internal communications containing advice, recommendations, or opinions reflecting the policymaking processes of the GLO. Therefore, the GLO 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 552.160 of the Government Code provides, in relevant part:

(b) Except as provided by Subsection (c), the following information maintained by a governmental body is confidential:

(1) the name, social security number, house number, street name, and telephone number of an individual or household that applies for state or federal disaster recovery funds; [and]

...

(3) any other information the disclosure of which would identify or tend to identify a person or household that applies for state or federal disaster recovery funds.

(c) The street name and census block group of and the amount of disaster recovery funds awarded to a person or household are not confidential after the date on which disaster recovery funds are awarded to the person or household.

Gov't Code § 552.160(b)(1), (3), (c); *see also id.* § 552.160(a); *id.* § 418.004(1) (defining "disaster" for purposes of section 552.160). You assert some of the remaining information consists of confidential information concerning individuals who applied for disaster recovery assistance. We note the requestor has a right of access to her own private information. *See id.* § 552.023(a) ("person or a person's authorized representative has special right of access, beyond right of general public, to information held by governmental body that relates to person and that is protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect that person's privacy interests"); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual requests information concerning herself). Thus, the identifying information pertaining to the requestor may not be withheld from her under section 552.160. Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue identifies or tends to identify a person other than the requestor or a

household not pertaining to the requestor that applied for state or federal disaster recovery funds. Therefore, the GLO may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.160 of the Government Code.

In summary, the GLO may withhold the information you marked under section 552.107 of the Government Code. The GLO may withhold the information we marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The GLO must release the remaining information to this requestor.<sup>4</sup>

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,

Blake Brennan  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

BBX/gw

Ref: ID# 855107

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>4</sup> As previously noted, the requestor has a special right of access to some of the information being released in this instance. See Gov't Code § 552.137(b); see also *id.* § 552.023(a); ORD 481 at 4. Because such information is confidential with respect to the general public, if the GLO receives another request for this information from a different requestor, the GLO must again seek a ruling from this office.