



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

December 17, 2010

Mr. Robert E. Hager
Nichols, Jackson, Dillard, Hager & Smith, L.L.P.
1800 Lincoln Plaza
500 North Akard
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2010-19054

Dear Mr. Hager:

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# 403184.

The Town of Bartonville (the "town"), which you represent, received a request for all town records related to specified ordinances and resolutions; specified town council meetings and agenda items; and specified compressors, compressor stations, and extraterritorial property for specified time periods. You state you have provided the requestor with some of the requested information. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107 and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

We first note that some of the submitted information was created after the date of the town's receipt of this request for information. The Act does not require a governmental body to release information that did not exist when it received a request or create responsive information. Thus, the portions of the submitted information that did not exist when the town received this request are not responsive to the request. This decision does not address the public availability of that information, which we have marked, and the town need not release it in response to this request.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information that comes 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* 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 “for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services” to the client governmental body. *See* 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. *See 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. *See* TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1)(A)-(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 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. *See Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, no pet.). 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 the town and an attorney for the town. You explain these communications were made in confidence for the rendering of legal advice to the town and have remained confidential. You have identified the privileged parties to these communications. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to most of the submitted information. Accordingly, the town may generally withhold most of the submitted responsive information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. However, we note some of the submitted information consists of communications with parties you have not identified. Therefore, you have failed to demonstrate that this information, which we have marked, is a communication between privileged parties and the town may not withhold it under section 552.107. Further, we note that two of the responsive e-mail strings include communications with non-privileged parties. If the communications with these non-privileged parties, which we have marked, exist separate and apart from the e-mail strings in which they appear, then the town may not withhold the communications with the non-privileged parties under section 552.107(1).

Section 552.111 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.” Gov’t Code § 552.111. This section 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 reexamined the predecessor to the section 552.111 exception 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 consisting of advice, recommendations, and opinions reflecting the policymaking processes of the governmental body. *See* ORD 615 at 5. A governmental body’s policymaking functions do not encompass internal administrative or personnel matters, and disclosure of information relating to such matters will not inhibit free discussion among agency personnel as to policy issues. *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). However, 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 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 date impractical, the factual information also may be withheld under section 552.111. *See* Open Records Decision No. 313 at 3 (1982). When determining if an interagency memorandum is excepted from disclosure under section 552.111, we must consider whether the agencies between which the memorandum is passed share a privity of interest or common deliberative process with regard to the policy matter at issue. *See* Open Records Decision No. 561 at 9 (1990).

Section 552.111 can also encompass communications between a governmental body and a third party with a privity of interest. *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 authority), 561 at 9 (1990) (section 552.111 encompasses communications with party with which governmental body has privity of interest or common deliberative process). When determining if an interagency memorandum is excepted from disclosure under section 552.111, we must consider whether the agencies between which the memorandum is passed share a privity of interest or common deliberative process with regard to the policy matter at issue. *See id.* 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 id.*

You state the remaining information consists of internal memoranda between the town attorney and town staff regarding legal advice and recommendations. However, upon review, we find the remaining information consists of communications with third parties. You have not explained how the town shares a privity of interest or common deliberative process with these third parties. Accordingly, we find none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

In summary, with the exception of the information we have marked for release, the town may withhold the submitted responsive information under section 552.107 of the Government Code. However, if the communications with the non-privileged parties exist separate and apart from the e-mail strings in which they appear, then the town may not withhold these communications under section 552.107 of the Government Code. The remaining responsive information must be released.

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.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php, 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 must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General, toll free at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Andrea L. Caldwell
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

ALC/eeg

Ref: ID# 403184

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)