



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 25, 2022

Mr. Brian Sears
Assistant General Counsel
Texas Department of Public Safety
PO Box 4087
Austin, Texas 78773-0001

OR2022-25849

Dear Mr. Sears:

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# 966756 (PIR# 22-1459).

The Texas Department of Public Safety (the "department") received a request for communications received or sent by any of six department officials during a certain time period. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, 552.108, 552.111, and 552.152 of the Government Code. Additionally, you state release of the information at issue may implicate the interests of the governor's office. We have received comments from the governor's office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (providing that interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released). We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

We note portions of the submitted information were the subject of previous requests for information, in response to which this office issued Open Records Letter Nos. 2022-24396 (2022) and 2022-[968592]. We have no indication the law, facts, or circumstances on which the prior rulings were based have changed. Accordingly, the department must continue to rely on Open Records Letter Nos. 2022-24396 (2022) and 2022-[968592] as previous determinations and withhold or release the information at issue in accordance with

¹ 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.

those rulings.² *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 at 6-7 (2001) (discussing criteria for first type of previous determination). To the extent the submitted information was not subject to prior rulings, we will address your arguments.

Section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the internal records and notations of law enforcement agencies and prosecutors when their release would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. Gov't Code § 552.108(b)(1); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 531 at 2 (1989) (quoting *Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977)). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(b)(1) must explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.108(b)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706. Section 552.108(b)(1) is intended to protect “information which, if released, would permit private citizens to anticipate weaknesses in a police department, avoid detection, jeopardize officer safety, and generally undermine police efforts to effectuate the laws of this State.” *See City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320 at 327 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.). This office has concluded section 552.108(b)(1) excepts from public disclosure information relating to the security or operation of a law enforcement agency. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 (release of detailed use of force guidelines would unduly interfere with law enforcement), 252 (1980) (section 552.108 of the Government Code is designed to protect investigative techniques and procedures used in law enforcement), 143 (1976) (disclosure of specific operations or specialized equipment directly related to investigation or detection of crime may be excepted). Section 552.108(b)(1) is not applicable, however, to generally known policies and procedures. *See, e.g.*, ORDs 531 at 2-3 (Penal Code provisions, common law rules, and constitutional limitations on use of force not protected), 252 at 3 (governmental body failed to indicate why investigative procedures and techniques requested were any different from those commonly known).

You state the information at issue, if released, would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution of crime. You state the information at issue reveals “department techniques used to investigate and detect activities of suspected criminal elements; how information is assessed and analyzed; how information is shared among partner law enforcement agencies[;] and the lessons learned from the analysis of prior criminal activities.” Based on your representations and our review, we agree the release of the information at issue would interfere with law enforcement. Accordingly, the department may withhold the information it marked under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code.³

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. 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

² As we are able to make this determination, we need not address the arguments against disclosure of this information.

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

“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 state the information at issue consists of communications between the department attorneys and officials. You state the communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the department. You further state these communications were intended to be confidential 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. Thus, the department may withhold the information it marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.⁴

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. This exception encompasses information that is made confidential by other statutes. The department and the governor’s office raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.176 of the Texas Homeland Security Act (the “HSA”), chapter 418 of the Government Code. Sections 418.176 through 418.182 were added to chapter 418 as part of the HSA. These provisions make certain information related to terrorism confidential. Section 418.176 of the HSA provides in relevant part:

⁴ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

(a) Information is confidential if the information is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental entity for the purpose of preventing, detecting, responding to, or investigating an act of terrorism or related criminal activity and:

- (1) relates to the staffing requirements of an emergency response provider, including a law enforcement agency, a fire-fighting agency, or an emergency services agency; [or]
- (2) relates to a tactical plan of the provider[.]

Id. § 418.176(a)(1), (2). The fact that information may relate to emergency preparedness does not make such information *per se* confidential under the HSA. *See* Open Records Decision No. 649 at 3 (1996) (language of confidentiality provision controls scope of its protection). Furthermore, the mere recitation by a governmental body of a statute’s key terms is not sufficient to demonstrate the applicability of a claimed provision. As with any exception to disclosure, a governmental body asserting one of the confidentiality provisions of the HSA must adequately explain how the responsive records fall within the scope of the claimed provision. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must explain how claimed exception to disclosure applies).

The department asserts the information at issue reveals staffing requirements of a law enforcement agency, the Office of the Governor Protective Detail, which is staffed with security personnel of the Executive Protection Bureau of the department. The department states the information at issue reveals the identity of personnel and the staffing requirements related to the protection of the governor. The department further states this information is maintained to prevent, detect, respond to, or investigate an act of criminal activity or terrorism. Upon review, we find the information at issue relates to the staffing requirements or tactical plan of a law enforcement agency and is maintained by or for a governmental entity for the purpose of preventing, detecting, responding to, or investigating an act of terrorism or related criminal activity. Therefore, the department must withhold the information it marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.176 of the Government Code.⁵

Section 552.111 of the Government Code exempts 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[.]” *Id.* § 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

⁵ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of the remaining information.

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

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 Nos. 631 at 2 (section 552.111 encompasses information created for governmental body by outside consultant acting at governmental body's request and performing task that is within governmental body's authority), 561 at 9 (1990) (section 552.111 encompasses communications with party with which governmental body has privity of interest or common deliberative process), 462 at 14 (1987) (section 552.111 applies to memoranda prepared by governmental body's consultants). 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 at 9.

The department asserts the information at issue consists of advice, recommendations, and opinions of the department's staff regarding policymaking decisions. The department also inform us the information at issue includes draft documents that reflect the deliberations of staff. The department states the final version of these draft documents will be released to the public in their final form. Based on your representations and our review, we find the department may withhold the information it marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

In summary, the department must continue to rely on Open Records Letter Nos. 2022-24396 (2022) and 2022-[968592] as previous determinations and withhold or

release the information at issue in accordance with those rulings. The department may withhold the information it marked under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code. The department may withhold the information it marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The department must withhold the information it marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.176 of the Government Code. The department may withhold the information it marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The department 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,

Kelly McWethy
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KM/mo

Ref: ID# 966756

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)