



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 5, 2016

Mr. Gary Grief  
Executive Director  
Texas Lottery Commission  
P.O. Box 16630  
Austin, Texas 78761-6630

OR2016-10264

Dear Mr. Grief:

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# 608574 (TLC File # L-21065).

The Texas Lottery Commission (the "commission") received a request for (1) all e-mails sent to or received from a named individual since a specific date; (2) all e-mails mentioning the named individual in the subject or body of the message since a specific date; (3) all "paper correspondence" received from the named individual since a specific date; (4) all e-mails exchanged with any of eighteen employees of the Solicitor General's Office from within a specific date range; (5) all e-mails sent to or received from any e-mail address using a specified domain name since a specific date; (6) all requests for public information received by the commission mentioning the named individual since a specific date, to include the responses provided by the commission to those requestors, and any records deemed responsive to those requests; and (7) all e-mails exchanged with a named individual since a specific date. The commission claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107 and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the

exceptions the commission claims and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>1</sup>

Initially, we note we have marked some of the submitted information as non-responsive because it does not fit within any of the categories of the request. This ruling does not address the public availability of non-responsive information, and the commission is not required to release such information in response to this request.

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 (1993), 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 that 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). Additionally, section 552.111 does not generally except from disclosure purely factual information that is severable from the opinion portions of internal memoranda. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.); ORD 615 at 4-5. 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).

---

<sup>1</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.

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.

We note section 552.111 can encompass communications between a governmental body and a third party. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 631 at 2 (Gov't Code § 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) (Gov't Code § 552.111 encompasses communications with party with which governmental body has privity of interest or common deliberative process), 462 at 14 (1987) (Gov't Code § 552.111 applies to memoranda prepared by governmental body's consultants). When determining if an interagency communication is excepted from disclosure under section 552.111, we must consider whether the entities between which the communication is passed share a privity of interest or common deliberative process with regard to the policy matter at issue. *See id.* In order 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 commission asserts the information it has marked consists of advice, recommendations, and opinions of employees of the commission and individuals with whom the commission shares a privity of interest. The commission explains these communications pertain to the commission's policymaking decisions regarding operation of the lottery. The commission also states the information at issue includes draft documents the commission states were intended for release in their final form. Based on these representations and our review, we find the commission may withhold the information it has marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup>

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).

---

<sup>2</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the commission's remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

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)(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. *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).

The commission asserts the remaining responsive information consists of confidential communications involving commission employees and attorneys, outside counsel, and attorneys from the Office of the Attorney General who have been providing legal services to the commission. The commission states these communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the commission and the confidentiality of these communications has been maintained. Based on these representations and our review, we find the commission has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Thus, the commission may withhold the remaining responsive information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

In summary, the commission may withhold the information it has marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The commission may withhold the remaining responsive information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

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](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,



Rahat Huq  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

RSH/som

Ref: ID# 608574

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)