



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 25, 2016

Mr. Vic Ramirez
Associate General Counsel
Lower Colorado River Authority
P.O. Box 220
Austin, Texas 78767-0220

OR2016-11983

Dear Mr. Ramirez:

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# 611680.

The Lower Colorado River Authority (the "authority") received a request for all communications pertaining to the golden cheek warbler at the low water crossing park and seven specified key words. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107 and 552.111 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

¹Although the authority also raises section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with Rule 1.05 of the Texas Disciplinary Rules of Professional Conduct and Texas Rule of Evidence 503, this office has concluded section 552.101 does not encompass discovery privileges. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 1-2 (2002), 575 at 2 (1990). Furthermore, we note section 552.107 of the Government Code is the proper exception to claim for attorney-client privileged information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. ORD 676.

²We 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 that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

Initially, we note some of the requested information may have been the subject of a previous request for information, as a result of which this office issued Open Records Letter No. 2016-09869 (2016). We have no indication the law, facts, or circumstances on which the prior ruling was based have changed. Thus, to the extent the requested information is identical to the information previously requested and ruled upon, the authority may continue to rely on Open Records Letter No. 2016-09869 as a previous determination and withhold or release the identical information at issue in accordance with that ruling. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (so long as law, facts, and circumstances on which prior ruling was based have not changed, first type of previous determination exists where requested information is precisely same information as was addressed in a prior attorney general ruling, ruling is addressed to same governmental body, and ruling concludes that information is or is not excepted from disclosure). However, to the extent the requested information is not subject to the previous ruling, we will consider the authority's arguments against disclosure of the information at issue.

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. ORD 676 at 6-7. 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).

You state the submitted information consists of communications between authority employees and attorneys for the authority. You state the communications were made in confidence for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the authority and these communications have remained confidential. Upon review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the communications at issue. Therefore, the authority may generally withhold the submitted information under section 552.107(1).³ However, we note some of the otherwise privileged e-mail strings include e-mails sent to or received from non-privileged parties. Furthermore, if these e-mails are removed from the e-mail strings and stand alone, they are responsive to the instant request. Therefore, if the authority maintains these non-privileged e-mails, which we have marked, separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then the authority may not withhold the non-privileged e-mails under section 552.107(1). To the extent the non-privileged e-mails exist separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, we will consider your remaining argument under section 552.111 of the Government Code for that information.

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

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

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. 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* ORD 561.

You assert the information at issue is protected under section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, we find the information at issue consists of communications with individuals you have failed to demonstrate share a privity of interest or common deliberative process with the authority. Thus, we find you have not demonstrated the deliberative process privilege applies to this information. Accordingly, the authority may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.111.

To the extent the non-privileged e-mails exist separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, we note a portion of this information is subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code.⁴ Section 552.137 excepts from disclosure “an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body” unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). *See* Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail address at issue is not excluded by subsection (c). Therefore, the authority must withhold the e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137, unless the owner affirmatively consents to its public disclosure.

In summary, to the extent the requested information is identical to the information previously requested and ruled upon, the authority may continue to rely on Open Records Letter No. 2016-09869 as a previous determination and withhold or release the identical

⁴The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

information at issue in accordance with that ruling. The authority may generally withhold the submitted information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. However, if the authority maintains the non-privileged e-mails, which we have marked, separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then the authority may not withhold the non-privileged e-mails under section 552.107(1). To the extent the non-privileged e-mails exist separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, the authority must withhold the e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner affirmatively consents to its public disclosure, and 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 that reads "Cole Hutchison". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Cole Hutchison
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CH/akg

Ref: ID# 611680

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)