



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 7, 2015

Ms. Jordan Hale
Public Information Coordinator and Assistant General Counsel
Office of the Governor
P.O. Box 12428
Austin, Texas 78711

OR2015-25580

Dear Ms. Hale:

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# 587762 (OOG ID #15-363).

The Office of the Governor (the "governor's office") received a request for communications between the governor and/or the governor's staff that include specified terms. You state you are releasing most of the requested information to the requestor. You state you have redacted certain information protected by section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code pursuant to section 552.024(c)(2) of the Government Code, motor vehicle record information under section 552.130(c) of the Government Code, and personal e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).¹ You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under

¹Section 552.024(c)(2) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact information protected by section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code without the necessity of requesting a decision under the Act if the current or former employee or official to whom the information pertains timely chooses not to allow public access to the information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.024(c)(2). Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in subsection 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See id.* § 552.130(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.130(e). *See id.* § 552.130(d), (e). Open Records Decision No. 684 serves as a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information, including personal e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision. *See* ORD 684.

sections 552.101, 552.107, 552.111, and 552.152 of the Government Code. You also state you notified the Texas Department of Public Safety (the “department”) and the United States Department of Homeland Security (“DHHS”) of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released.² *See* Gov’t Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released). We have received comments from the department. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.³

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from 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, including the HSA. Section 418.176 of the HSA provides, in relevant part:

(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 generally be related to emergency preparedness does not make the information *per se* confidential under the provisions of the HSA. *See* Open Records Decision No. 649 at 3 (1996) (language of confidentiality provisions controls scope of its protection). As with any confidentiality statute, a governmental body asserting this section must adequately explain how the responsive information falls within the scope of the provision. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must explain how claimed exception to disclosure applies).

You state the information you have marked relates to the security detail of the governor and his family provided by the department. You explain the identities of the individuals at issue

²As of the date of this letter, we have not received any comments from DHHS explaining why any portion of the submitted information should not be released to the requestor.

³We assume that 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.

and the staffing requirements for the governor and his family are maintained for the purpose of preventing, detecting, responding to, or investigating an act of terrorism or related criminal activity. The department states some of the submitted information discusses ongoing operations by the department and other law enforcement agencies at the Texas border to detect, prevent, and respond to terroristic threats and other criminal activities. The department also states the information at issue includes staffing and equipment details related to these operations, and release of the information at issue would provide terrorists and other criminals to identify vulnerabilities and enforcement efforts at the Texas border. Upon review, we find the information you have marked, and the additional information we have marked, relates to staffing requirements of a law enforcement agency or a tactical plan of the provider 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 governor's office must withhold the information you have marked, and the additional information we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.176 of the Government Code.⁴

Section 552.106 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[a] draft or working paper involved in the preparation of proposed legislation[.]” *Id.* § 552.106(a). Section 552.106(a) ordinarily applies only to persons with a responsibility to prepare information and proposals for a legislative body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 460 at 1 (1987). The purpose of this exception is to encourage frank discussion on policy matters between the subordinates or advisors of a legislative body and the members of the legislative body. *Id.* at 2. 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. *Id.* Section 552.106 does not protect purely factual information from public disclosure. *See id.* at 2; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 344 at 3-4 (1982) (for purposes of statutory predecessor, factual information prepared by State Property Tax Board did not reflect policy judgments, recommendations, or proposals concerning drafting of legislation). However, a comparison or analysis of factual information prepared to support proposed legislation is within the scope of section 552.106. *See* ORD 460 at 2.

The department states some of the remaining information consists of communications between legislators, the governor's office, the department, and other governmental bodies regarding proposed legislation related to the department. We understand these parties have an official responsibility to provide policy judgments, recommendations, and proposals regarding the proposed legislation. Upon review, we find the information we have marked constitutes policy judgments, recommendations, and proposals regarding legislation related to the department. Therefore, the governor's office may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.106 of the Government Code. However, we find the department

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

has failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.106 to any of the remaining information at issue. Accordingly, the governor's office may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.106.

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. 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)(A), (B), (C), (D), (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: (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 information you have marked consists of communications between the governor, attorneys for the governor's office, and employees of the governor's office that were made for the purpose of providing legal services to the governor's office. You state the communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find the information you have marked consists of privileged attorney-client communications. Therefore, the governor's office may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.108(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if: (1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(1). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(1) must reasonably explain how and why release of the requested information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). Section 552.108 may be invoked by any proper custodian of information relating to a pending investigation or prosecution of criminal conduct. *See Open Records Decision No. 474 at 4-5 (1987)*. Where a non-law enforcement agency has custody of information that would otherwise qualify for exception under section 552.108 as information relating to the pending case of a law enforcement agency, the custodian of the records may withhold the information if it provides this office with a demonstration that the information relates to the pending case and a representation from the law enforcement agency that it wishes to have the information withheld.

The department states some of the remaining information relates to ongoing criminal investigations, and release of this information would interfere with these investigations. Based on the department’s representation, we conclude the governor’s office may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code on behalf of the department. *See Houston Chronicle Publ’g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases), *writ ref’d n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976).

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 reasonably 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 (Tex. 1977). 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.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 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).

The department states some of the remaining information discusses ongoing operations by the department and other law enforcement agencies at the Texas border to detect, prevent, and respond to terroristic threats and other criminal activities. The department explains the release of this information would reveal techniques used to identify potential threats to public safety. Based on the department’s representations and our review, we agree the release of the information at issue would interfere with law enforcement. Accordingly, the governor’s office may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code.⁵

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 (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.*

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

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.

The governor's office and the department state some of the remaining information consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations of the governor, employees of the governor's office, employees of the department, and employees of the Texas Department of Motor Vehicles (the "DMV"). You explain the governor's office shares a privity of interest with the department and the DMV on certain policymaking matters. The governor's office and department further state some of the information at issue consists of draft documents that were intended to be released in its final form. Upon review, we find the governor's office may withhold the information you have marked, and the additional information we have marked, under section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, we find the remaining information at issue consists of information that is administrative or purely factual in nature. Thus, the department has failed to demonstrate the remaining information reveals advice, opinions, or recommendations that pertain to policymaking. Accordingly, the governor's office 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 governor's office must withhold the information you have marked, and the additional information we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in

conjunction with section 418.176 of the Government Code. The governor's office may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.106 of the Government Code. The governor's office may withhold the information you marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The governor's office may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code on behalf of the department. The governor's office may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code. The governor's office may withhold the information you marked, and the additional information we have marked, under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The governor's office 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 http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, 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 may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Meredith L. Coffman', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Meredith L. Coffman
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MLC/dls

Ref: ID# 587762

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Molly Cost
Assistant General Counsel
Texas Department of Public Safety
P.O. Box 4087
Austin, Texas 78773-0001
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Rachel D. Fleet
Senior Security Specialist
Office of Internal Affairs Security Management Division
c/o Ms. Jordan Hale
Public Information Coordinator and Assistant General Counsel
Office of the Governor
P.O. Box 12428
Austin, Texas 78711
(w/o enclosure)