



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

November 29, 2007

Ms. Sharon Alexander  
Associate General Counsel  
Texas Department of Transportation  
125 East 11<sup>th</sup> Street  
Austin, Texas 78701-2483

OR2007-15700

Dear Ms. Alexander:

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# 294548.

The Texas Department of Transportation (the "department") received a request for information related to the marketing of specialty license plates. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107, 552.111, and 552.137 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>2</sup> We have also received and considered comments from My Plates, Inc. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released).

---

<sup>1</sup>Although you raise section 552.101 in conjunction with the attorney-client privilege, this office has concluded that section 552.101 does not encompass discovery privileges. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 1-2 (2002), 575 at 2 (1990).

<sup>2</sup>We 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.

Initially, we note that a portion of the submitted information has been previously ruled upon by this office in Open Records Letter No. 2007-14776 (2007). In that ruling we concluded that the department may withhold portions of the information at issue under sections 552.104 and 552.111 of the Government Code. As we have no indication that the law, facts, and circumstances surrounding this prior ruling have changed, you may continue to rely on Open Records Letter No. 2007-14776 as a previous determination and withhold the information in accordance with this prior ruling. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (so long as law, facts, 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). Because our determination with respect to this portion of the requested information is dispositive, we do not address the arguments submitted by My Plates Inc. However, to the extent that the information requested in this instance was not the subject of the ruling in Open Records Letter No. 2007-14776, we will address your arguments.

You assert that Exhibit B is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code. Section 552.107(1) 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 “for the purpose of facilitating 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). 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.* 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. *Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, no writ). 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).

In this case, you assert that the information in Exhibit B consists of communications made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services. You state that the communications were between clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives identified by the department, and the communications indicated that they were to be kept confidential among the intended parties. Finally, you state that the department has not waived its privilege with respect to any of the communications at issue. Based upon your representations, and our review, we conclude that you have failed to establish that a portion of the information at issue constitutes or documents privileged communications made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the department. Therefore, you may not withhold this information, which we have marked for release, under section 552.107. However, we conclude that the department may withhold the remaining information in Exhibit B under section 552.107.

Next, you assert that Exhibit C is excepted from disclosure under the deliberative process privilege encompassed by section 552.111 of the Government Code. *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 (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 Open Records Decision No. 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*. We also note that section 552.111 encompasses external communications with a third party with which a governmental body shares a privity of interest or a common deliberative process with respect to the policy matter at issue. *See Open Records Decision No. 561 at 9 (1990) (addressing statutory predecessor)*.

This office has also concluded that 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 assert that Exhibit C consists of internal memoranda, communications, and draft documents pertaining to department policy. Based on your representations and our review, we find that you have established that the deliberative process privilege is applicable to the portions of the records that we have marked. However, you have failed to explain how the remaining information, which generally consists of routine non-policy matters and factual information, constitutes advice, recommendations, opinions, or material reflecting the policymaking processes of the department. Therefore, you may not withhold the remaining information in Exhibit C under section 552.111.

Next, you state that the remaining information contains e-mail addresses that are excepted from disclosure under section 552.137 of the Government Code, which requires a governmental body to withhold the e-mail address of a member of the general public, unless the individual to whom the e-mail address belongs has affirmatively consented to its public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.137 (b). You do not inform us that the owners of the e-mail addresses have affirmatively consented to release. Therefore, the department must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137.

In summary, the department must rely on our decision in Open Records Letter No. 2007-14776 with respect to the information requested in this instance that was previously ruled upon in that decision. Except for the information we have marked for release, you may withhold Exhibit B under section 552.107 of the Government Code. You may withhold the information we have marked in Exhibit C under section 552.111. You must withhold the e-mail addresses that we have marked under section 552.137. The remaining information must be released to the requestor.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by

filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Office of the Attorney General at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Justin D. Gordon  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JDG/jh

Ref: ID# 294548

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Emily Ramshaw  
The Dallas Morning News  
1005 Congress Avenue, Suite 930  
Austin, Texas 78701  
(w/o enclosures)