



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

November 8, 2012

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

OR2012-17985

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# 470831.

The Texas Department of Transportation (the "department") received a request for information related to lobbying, advocacy, or consulting concerning federal legislation or rule changes by any member of the department or its consultants or surrogates, including a named individual, during a specified period of time. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107 and 552.111 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Although you also raise section 552.101 of the Government Code 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.

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* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate 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, lawyer representatives, and a lawyer representing another party in a pending action and concerning a matter of common interest therein. *See* 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. *See 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 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 assert the documents in Exhibit B consist of attorney-client privileged communications between department attorneys, outside counsel, and non-lawyers within the agency for the purpose of providing legal advice. You state the department has not waived its attorney-client privilege with regard to any of the information at issue. Further, you have identified the parties to the communications. Therefore, based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the submitted information. Thus, the department may generally withhold the submitted information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. We note, however, some of the e-mail strings include e-mails received from or sent to non-privileged parties.

Furthermore, if the e-mails received from or sent to non-privileged parties are removed from the e-mail string and stand alone, they are responsive to the request for information. Therefore, if these non-privileged e-mails, which we have marked, are maintained by the department separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail string in which they appear, then the department may not withhold these non-privileged e-mails under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

To the extent those non-privileged e-mails are maintained by the department separate and apart from the submitted e-mail string in which they appear, you also raise section 552.111 of the Government Code. 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. Section 552.111 encompasses the deliberative process privilege. *See* Open Records Decision No. 615 at 2 (1993). The purpose of this exception 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, orig. proceeding); 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, opinions, recommendations, 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). Further, section 552.111 does not protect facts and written observations of facts and events that are 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.

Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate how the department shares a privity of interest or common deliberative process with the non-privileged parties in the e-mails at issue. Therefore, the department may not withhold this information under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

We note the non-privileged e-mails contain e-mail addresses subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code. Section 552.137 of the Government Code 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).<sup>3</sup> Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail addresses at issue are not a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c) of the Government Code. Accordingly, the department must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners of the e-mail addresses have affirmatively consented to their disclosure.

In summary, the department may generally withhold the submitted information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. If the non-privileged e-mails, which we have marked, are maintained by the department separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then the department may not withhold these non-privileged e-mails under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code, and they must be released. The department must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners consent to their release.

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](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

---

<sup>3</sup>The 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 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,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Kristi L. Wilkins".

Kristi L. Wilkins  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

KLW/ag

Ref: ID# 470831

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)