ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

June 16, 2008

Mr. Charles K. Kimbrough
Bickerstaff, Heath, Delgado, Acosta, LLP
816 Congress Avenue, Suite 1700
Austin, Texas 78701

OR2008-08181

Dear Mr. Kimbrough:

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# 312941.

Llano County (the "county"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to the development of a specified property. You state that you have released a portion of the requested information. You claim that portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, 552.111, 552.130, and 552.137 of the Government Code.[1] We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the information you have submitted.

Initially, we note that portions of the submitted information, which we have marked, are not responsive to the instant request because they were created after the date the request was received. The county need not release nonresponsive information in response to this request and this ruling will not address that information.

Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses section 551.104(c) of the Government Code, which provides

[1]Although you raise Texas Rule of Evidence 503 and Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5, we note that, in this instance, the proper exceptions to raise when asserting the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges for information not subject to section 552.022 are sections 552.107 and 552.111. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 677 (2002), 676 at 6 (2002). Additionally, we note that section 552.101does not encompass the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. *See* ORD 676 at 1-3(Gov't Code § 552.101 does not encompass discovery privileges).

that "[t]he certified agenda or tape of a closed meeting is available for public inspection and copying *only under a court order issued under Subsection (b)(3)*." Gov't Code § 551.104(c) (emphasis added). The county is not required to submit the certified agenda or tape recording of a closed meeting to this office for review. *See* Open Records Decision No. 495 at 4 (1988) (attorney general lacks authority to review certified agendas or tapes of executive sessions to determine whether a governmental body may withhold such information from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.101 of the Government Code). Such information cannot be released to a member of the public in response to an open records request. *See id.* Section 551.146 of the Open Meetings Act makes it a criminal offense to disclose a certified agenda or tape recording of a lawfully closed meeting to a member of the public. *See* Gov't Code § 551.146(a)-(b). Therefore, the county must withhold the tape recordings of the closed session from public disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 551.104(c) of the Government Code.[2]

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). 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 Texas 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). 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.*, 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

---

[2]As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure for this information.

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 that the remaining information in Exhibit C and the information in Exhibit D consist of confidential communications between county attorneys and county representatives that were made for the purpose of rendering professional legal advice. You also state that the confidentiality of the communications has been maintained. Based on these representations and our review of the information at issue, we agree that most of Exhibit C and all of the information in Exhibit D consist of privileged attorney-client communications that the county may withhold under section 552.107.[3] For the remaining information in Exhibit C, you have failed to identify, and the documents do not identify, several of the communicants or their relationship to the county. Because you have failed to demonstrate that the attorney-client privilege protects these communications, we conclude that the remaining information in Exhibit C, which we have marked, is not excepted under section 552.107.

You seek to withhold from disclosure the remaining information in Exhibit C and Exhibit E under section 552.111 of the Government Code, which excepts from disclosure "an interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency." 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 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).

---

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

Further, section 552.111 does not protect facts and written observations of facts and events that are severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *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 consultant. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 631 at 2 (1995) (section 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) (section 552.111 encompasses communications with party with which governmental body has privity of interest or common deliberative process), 462 at 14 (1987) (section 552.111 applies to memoranda prepared by governmental body's consultants). 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.

You explain that the county has retained a third party consultant to assist the county. You state that the information at issue constitutes advice, opinion, and recommendations on policymaking matters of the county relating to development issues. Based upon your representations and our review of the information at issue, we agree that the county may withhold the information we have marked in Exhibit E under section 552.111 of the Government Code. We find, however, that you have not demonstrated that any of the remaining information at issue consists of advice, opinions, or recommendations that implicate the county's policymaking processes. We therefore conclude that the county may not withhold any of the remaining information in Exhibits C and E on the basis of the deliberative process privilege under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Section 552.111 also encompasses the attorney work product privilege found at rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. *See* TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5; *City of Garland*, 22 S.W.3d at 360; Open Records Decision No. 677 at 4-8 (2002). Rule 192.5 defines attorney work product as consisting of

> (1) material prepared or mental impressions developed in anticipation of litigation or for trial by or for a party or a party's representatives, including the party's attorneys, consultants, sureties, indemnitors, insurers, employees, or agents; or
>
> (2) a communication made in anticipation of litigation or for trial between a party and the party's representatives or among a party's representatives, including the party's attorneys, consultants, sureties, indemnitors, insurers, employees or agents.

TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5. A governmental body that seeks to withhold information on the basis of the attorney work product privilege under section 552.111 bears the burden of demonstrating that the information was created or developed for trial or in anticipation of litigation by or for a party or a party's representative. *See id.*; ORD 677 at 6-8. In order for this office to conclude that information was created or developed in anticipation of litigation, we must be satisfied that

> (a) a reasonable person would have concluded from the totality of the circumstances surrounding the investigation that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue; and (b) the party resisting discovery believed in good faith that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue and [created or obtained the information] for the purpose of preparing for such litigation.

Nat'l Tank Co. v. Brotherton, 851 S.W.2d 193, 207 (Tex. 1993). A "substantial chance" of litigation does not mean a statistical probability, but rather "that litigation is more than merely an abstract possibility or unwarranted fear." *Id.* at 204; ORD 677 at 7.

You also appear to claim the work product privilege under section 552.111 for the remaining information in Exhibits C and E. You have not demonstrated, however, that any of the remaining information consists of material prepared or mental impressions developed in anticipation of litigation or for trial by a party or a representative of a party. Likewise, you have not sufficiently shown that any of the remaining information in Exhibits C and E consists of a communication made in anticipation of litigation or for trial between a party and a representative of a party or among a party's representatives. *See* TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5. We therefore conclude that the county may not withhold any of the remaining information in Exhibits C and E on the basis of the attorney work product privilege under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Next, you claim section 552.130 of the Government Code for portions of the remaining information. Section 552.130 excepts from disclosure information that "relates to . . . a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license or permit issued by an agency of this state [or] a motor vehicle title or registration issued by an agency of this state." Gov't Code § 552.130. Upon review, we find that the county must withhold the Texas motor vehicle record information it has marked in Exhibit F and the information we have marked in Exhibit E under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

You claim that section 552.137 of the Government Code pertains to portions of the remaining information. Section 552.137 provides that "an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body is confidential and not subject to disclosure under [the Act]," unless the owner of the e-mail address has affirmatively consented to its public disclosure. *Id.* § 552.137(a)-(b). The types of e-mail addresses listed in section 552.137(c) may not be withheld under this exception. *See id.* § 552.137(c). Likewise, section 552.137 is not applicable to an institutional e-mail address, an Internet website address, or an e-mail

address that a governmental entity maintains for one of its officials or employees. We have marked personal e-mail addresses in Exhibits C, E, and G that the county must withhold under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners of the e-mail addresses have affirmatively consented to their public disclosure or section 552.137(c) applies.

We note that a portion of the submitted information is protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are protected by copyright. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.* If a member of the public wishes to make copies of materials protected by copyright, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit. *See* Open Records Decision No. 550 (1990).

In summary, the county must withhold the tape recordings of closed sessions under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 551.104 of the Government Code. With the exception of the information we have marked, the county may withhold the remaining information in Exhibit C and the entirety of Exhibit D under section 552.107. The county may withhold the information we have marked in Exhibit E under section 552.111. The county must withhold the information it has marked in Exhibit F and the information we have marked in Exhibit E under section 552.130. The county must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked in Exhibits C, E, and G unless the owners of the e-mail addresses have affirmatively consented to their release or section 552.137(c) applies. The remaining information must be released, but any copyrighted information may only be released in accordance with copyright law.

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 file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, 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 challenge 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,



Melanie J. Villars
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MJV/jh

Ref: ID# 312941

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. James M. Nias
Jackson Walker L.L.P.
100 Congress Avenue, Suite 1100
Austin, Texas 78701
(w/o enclosures)