



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

January 5, 2011

Ms. Jennifer Soldano
Legal Counsel
Texas Department of Motor Vehicles
4000 Jackson Avenue
Austin, Texas 78731

OR2011-00281

Dear Ms. Soldano:

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# 405002.

The Texas Department of Motor Vehicles (the "department") received a request for specified legislative initiatives from the last five legislative sessions and a specified analysis of the Texas motor vehicle fleet.¹ You state you have released some of the requested information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under

¹You inform us the requestor verbally modified the request for information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (governmental body may communicate with requestor for purpose of clarifying or narrowing request for information).

sections 552.106, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code.² We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.³

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information that comes 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 “for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services” to the client governmental body. *See* 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. *See 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, lawyer representatives, and a lawyer representing another party in a pending action and concerning a matter of common interest therein. *See* TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1)(A)-(E). 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 to whom disclosure is made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client or those reasonably necessary for the transmission of 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, no pet.). 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

²Although you also raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 552.107 of the Government Code, this office has concluded section 552.101 does not encompass other exceptions found in the Act. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 1-2 (2002), 575 at 2 (1990). Further, although you also raise rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure, we note section 552.107 is the proper exception to raise when asserting the attorney-client privilege for information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 (2002).

³We 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.

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 submitted information involves attorney-client communications. You indicate the communications are between department attorneys and department employees and were made for the purpose of obtaining legal advice. You state the department has not waived its privilege with respect to any of the information at issue. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to portions of the submitted information, which we have marked. Accordingly, the department may generally withhold the marked information under section 552.107 of the Government Code. We note portions of the individual e-mails contained in the otherwise privileged e-mail strings are communications with an individual you have not demonstrated is a privileged party. Thus, to the extent these non-privileged e-mails, which we have marked, exist separate and apart from the submitted e-mail strings, they may not be withheld under section 552.107. Further, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information consists of communications between privileged parties. Thus, the department may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.107 of the Government Code.

Section 552.111 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "an interagency or intra-agency 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, no writ); *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 that are 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).

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.*

This office has also concluded a preliminary draft of a document that is 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.

You state the remaining information consists of intra-agency communications of internal pre-decisional deliberations regarding agency policy. You state the information at issue consists of advice, recommendations, and opinions of department personnel. Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we find the department has demonstrated portions of the remaining information, which we have marked, consist of advice, opinions, or recommendations on the policymaking matters of the department.⁴ Thus, the department may withhold the marked information under section 552.111 of the Government Code. Upon review, however, we find the remaining information at issue has been shared with individuals with whom you have not demonstrated the department shares a privity of interest. Thus, we find you have failed to show how the remaining information at issue consists of advice, opinions, or recommendations on the policymaking matters of the

⁴You state at the time the information at issue was created, the department was a part of the Texas Department of Transportation. You further state on November 1, 2009, the part of the Texas Department of Transportation that created the information at issue became part of the department.

department. Accordingly, the remaining information at issue may not be withheld under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

We next address your argument under section 552.106 of the Government Code. Section 552.106 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* Open Records Decision Nos. 615 at 2 (1993), 460 at 1-2 (1987). Therefore, section 552.106 is applicable only to the policy judgments, recommendations, and proposals of persons who are involved in the preparation of proposed legislation and who have an official responsibility to provide such information to members of the legislative body. *See* ORD 460 at 2; *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 assert the remaining information relates to the preparation of proposed legislation. However, you do not inform us the department had any official responsibility to an involved legislative body to provide legislative advice, policy judgments, recommendations, or proposals to its members. Further, you have not indicated any information constitutes an internal bill analysis or working paper prepared by the governor’s office for the purpose of evaluating proposed legislation. We therefore conclude the department may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.106 of the Government Code.

In summary, the department may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.107 of the Government Code; however, to the extent the marked non-privileged e-mails exist separate and apart from the submitted e-mail strings, they may not be withheld under section 552.107. The department may withhold the information we have marked under sections 552.111 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.

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 http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php, or call the Office of the Attorney General’s Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public

information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General, toll free at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Claire Morris Sloan".

Claire V. Morris Sloan
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CVMS/tf

Ref: ID# 405002

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)