



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

July 30, 2013

Ms. Elizabeth Hanshaw Winn  
Assistant County Attorney  
Travis County  
P.O. Box 1748  
Austin, Texas 78767-1748

OR2013-13139

Dear Ms. Winn:

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# 494791.

The Office of the Travis County Commissioner, Precinct 3 (the "commissioner's office") received a request for all correspondence to or from the commissioner and/or his executive assistants referencing proposed named roads and toll roads from January 2012 to the date of the request. You state the commissioner's office is releasing some of the responsive information to the requestor, but claim the remaining requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information. We have also received and considered comments from the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released). Initially, we note a portion of the submitted information, which we have marked, is not responsive to the instant request because it was created after the date the request was received. This ruling does not address the public availability of non-responsive information, and the commissioner's office is not required to release non-responsive information in response to this request.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. *Id.* § 552.107(1). 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 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, 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. *Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, no pet.). Section 552.107(1) generally excepts an entire communication 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 e-mail communications you have marked were made by lawyers of the Travis County Attorney’s Office and the commissioner’s office staff for the purpose of providing legal services to the commissioner’s office. You state these e-mails were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information we have marked. Thus, the commissioner’s office may generally withhold the information we have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. We note, however, some of these otherwise privileged 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 otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear and stand alone, they are responsive to the requests for information. Therefore, if these non-privileged e-mails, which we have marked, are maintained by the commissioner’s office separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then the commissioner’s office may not withhold these non-privileged e-mails under section 552.107(1). Further, some of the submitted e-mails were sent to or received by individuals you have not demonstrated are privileged parties. Thus, we find you have not demonstrated the remaining information reveals privileged attorney-client communications for the purposes of section 552.107(1). Thus, the remaining information may not be withheld on that basis.

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. 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, orig. proceeding). We determined 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).

This office has also concluded a preliminary draft of a document 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.

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 Nos. 631 at 2 (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 state the information you have marked consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations regarding policy issues concerning the State Highway 45 Southwest toll road ("SH 45"). The submitted information reflects the commissioner serves as a member of the Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization ("CAMPO") SH 45 Committee. Upon review, we find the commissioner's office and CAMPO share a privity of interest. We understand the information you have marked pertains to CAMPO policy or reflects the deliberative and policymaking process of the CAMPO SH 45 Committee. We note some of the information you marked contains draft documents. You do not state whether the draft documents will be released to the public in final form. Thus, to the extent the draft documents will be released to the public in their final form, the commissioner's office may withhold them in their entirety under section 552.111. If the draft documents will not be released to the public in their final form, then the commissioner's office may not withhold them in their entirety under section 552.111. Further, we find the information we have marked, including information within some of the draft documents if they will not be released in final form, consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations pertaining to a policymaking matter. Accordingly, the commissioner's office may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111. However, we find the remaining information at issue consists of either general administrative information that does not relate to policymaking or information that is purely factual in nature. Thus, we find you have failed to demonstrate how the remaining information at issue is excepted under section 552.111. Accordingly, the remaining information at issue may not be withheld under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This section encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information (1) containing highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. The type of information considered intimate or embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. *Id.* at 683. The type of information considered intimate or embarrassing by the

Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. *Id.* at 683. Upon review, we find the information we have marked is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Therefore, the commissioner's office must withhold the marked information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find none of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public interest. Accordingly, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.117 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home address and telephone number, emergency contact information, social security number, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who request this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> Gov't Code § 552.117(a). Whether a particular piece of information is protected by section 552.117 must be determined at the time the request for it is made. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Thus, information may be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) only on behalf of a current or former employee who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. Information may not be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee who did not timely request under section 552.024 the information be kept confidential. Therefore, to the extent the individual at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024, the commissioner's office must withhold the information we have marked in the remaining information under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. Conversely, to the extent the individual at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024, the commissioner's office may not withhold the information under section 552.117(a)(1).

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). *See* Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail addresses at issue are not excluded by subsection (c). Therefore, the commissioner's office must withhold the personal e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure.

In summary, the commissioner's office may generally withhold the information we have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. However, if the non-privileged

---

<sup>1</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

e-mails we have marked are maintained by the commissioner's office separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then the commissioner's office may not withhold the non-privileged e-mails under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. To the extent the marked draft documents will be released to the public in their final form, the commissioner's office may withhold them in their entireties under section 552.111. The commissioner's office may also withhold the advice, opinions, and recommendations we have marked, including information within some of the draft documents if they will not be released in final form, under section 552.111. The commissioner's office must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. To the extent the individual at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the commissioner's office must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The commissioner's office must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure. The remaining 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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open\\_orl\\_ruling\\_info.shtml](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,



Britni Fabian  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

BF/dls

Ref: ID# 494791

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)