



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 1, 2022

Mr. Montgomery Meitler  
Senior Counsel  
Texas Education Agency  
1701 North Congress Avenue  
Austin, Texas 78701-1494

OR2022-02943

Dear Mr. Meitler:

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# 927549 (TEA PIR#s 50445, 50761, and 50829).

The Texas Education Agency (the "agency") received three requests from different requestors for information related to the agency's implementation of specified legislation.<sup>1</sup> You state the agency has released some information to the requestors. You claim some of 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 representative sample of information.<sup>2</sup>

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

---

<sup>1</sup> You state the agency sought and received clarification of the information requested from the second requestor. *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 that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or overbroad request for information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

<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.

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 state the information you marked consists of communications between agency employees, legislators, and legislative staff members pertaining to proposed legislation. You explain, “[t]hese communications were conducted under the direction of members of the legislature to support their development of legislation.” You further explain that the agency’s employees “provided advice, recommendation, and opinion in the preparation of proposed legislation and prepared information at the request of the legislature concerning such legislation.” Upon review, we find you have demonstrated the information at issue constitutes policy judgments, recommendations, and proposals regarding proposed legislation related to the agency. Accordingly, the agency may withhold the information you marked under section 552.106 of the Government Code.

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. 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. 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 state the information you marked consists of communications between attorneys for the agency and agency employees that were made for the purpose of providing legal services to the agency. You further state the communications were intended to be, and have remained, confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find the agency may generally withhold the information you marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. We note, however, some of the e-mail strings at issue 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 e-mail strings and stand alone, they are responsive to the requests for information. Therefore, if these non-privileged e-mails, which we marked, are maintained by the agency separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then the agency may not withhold these non-privileged e-mails 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, 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).

The 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, underling, 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 section 552.111 for some of the remaining information. You state the information at issue consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations that were communicated between agency staff and third parties with whom the agency shares a privity of interest regarding the policymaking functions at issue. You state the information at issue includes drafts of policymaking documents that have been or will be released to the public in their final forms. Based upon these representations and our review of the information at issue, we find you have demonstrated some of the information at issue consists of advice, opinions, or recommendations on the policymaking matters of the agency. Accordingly, with the exception of the information we marked for release, the agency may withhold the information you marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, we find the remaining information at issue consists of communications with third parties with whom you have not demonstrated the agency shares a privity of interest or common deliberative process. 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 agency. Therefore, the agency 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.

In summary, the agency may withhold the information you marked under section 552.106 of the Government Code. The agency may generally withhold the information you marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code; however, if the non-privileged e-mails, which we marked, are maintained by the agency separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then the agency may not withhold the

non-privileged e-mails under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. With the exception of the information we marked for release, the agency may withhold the information you marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The agency 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,

Deborah Southerland  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

DS/ba

Ref: ID# 927549

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 2 Requestors  
(w/o enclosures)