



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

September 25, 2013

Representative Stephanie Klick  
State Representative, District 91  
State of Texas  
P.O. Box 2910  
Austin, Texas 78768-2910

OR2013-16670

Dear Representative Klick:

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# 500005.

The Office of State Representative Stephanie Klick (the "representative's office") received a request for all records from a specified time period received directly or indirectly from the American Legislative Exchange Council (the "council") relating to the council's recent conference and task force meetings. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.111 of the Government Code. Additionally, you state you have notified the council of its right to submit comments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released). We have received comments from the council. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information. We have also received and considered comments from representatives of the requestor and an attorney for the Freedom of Information Foundation of Texas. *See id.*

The council contends that the identifying information of the council's members in the information at issue is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the holding of the Texas Supreme Court in *In re Bay Area Citizens*

*Against Lawsuit Abuse*, 982 S.W.2d 371 (Tex. 1998).<sup>1</sup> In that decision, the Texas Supreme Court determined that the First Amendment right to freedom of association could protect an advocacy organization's list of contributors from compelled disclosure through a discovery request in pending litigation. In reaching this conclusion, the court stated:

Freedom of association for the purpose of advancing ideas and airing grievances is a fundamental liberty guaranteed by the First Amendment. *NAACP v. Alabama*, 357 U.S. 449, 460, 78 S.Ct. 1163, 2 L.Ed.2d 1488 (1958). Compelled disclosure of the identities of an organization's members or contributors may have a chilling effect on the organization's contributors as well as on the organization's own activity. See *Buckley v. Valeo*, 424 U.S. 1, 66-68, 96 S.Ct. 612, 46 L.Ed.2d 659 (1976). For this reason, the First Amendment requires that a compelling state interest be shown before a court may order disclosure of membership in an organization engaged in the advocacy of particular beliefs. *Tilton*, 869 S.W.2d at 956 (citing *NAACP*, 357 U.S. at 462-63, 78 S.Ct. 1163). "[I]t is immaterial whether the beliefs sought to be advanced by association pertain to political, economic, religious or cultural matters, and state action which may have the effect of curtailing the freedom to associate is subject to the closest scrutiny." *Id.*

*Bay Area Citizens*, 982 S.W.2d at 375-76 (footnote omitted). The court held that the party resisting disclosure bears the initial burden of making a *prima facie* showing that disclosure will burden First Amendment rights but noted that "the burden must be light." *Id.* at 376. Quoting the United State Supreme Court's decision in *Buckley v. Valeo*, 424 U.S. 1, 74 (1976), the Texas court determined that the party resisting disclosure must show "a reasonable probability that the compelled disclosure of a party's contributors' names will subject them to threats, harassment, or reprisals from either Government officials or private parties." *Id.* Such proof may include "specific evidence of past or present harassment of members due to their associational ties, or of harassment directed against the organization itself." *Id.* We believe the term "contributor" encompasses both the identities of those individuals and corporations who make financial donations to the council and volunteers who donate their time and services to the council.

The council states there is more than a reasonable probability that the compelled disclosure of documents containing the names of members will subject such members and the council to threats, harassment, or reprisals from private parties. We note, however, the submitted information only contains the names of two council members, both of which are available on the council's website. Having considered the council's arguments and the submitted information, we find the council has failed to present any specific evidence that release of

---

<sup>1</sup>Section 552.101 of the Government Code exempts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision" and encompasses information made confidential by constitutional law or judicial decision. Gov't Code § 552.101.

the information at issue would burden any particular individual's First Amendment rights. Accordingly, we conclude that none of the information at issue may be withheld under the right of association.

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. 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 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).

Further, section 552.111 does not protect facts and written observations of facts and events 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 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.

You state some of the submitted information consists of drafts of legislation provided to the representative's office by the council for discussion purposes. However, we find you have failed to demonstrate the representative's office shares a privity of interest with the council. *Cf.* Open Records Decision No. 429 (1985) (predecessor to section 552.106 not applicable to materials prepared by person or agency who has no official responsibility to do so but only acts as interested party who wishes to influence legislative process); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 460 at 3 (1987) (predecessor to section 552.106 resembles predecessor to section 552.111 in that both exceptions protect advice, opinion, and recommendations on policy matters in order to encourage frank discussion during the policy-making process). Thus, we find you have failed to demonstrate the information at issue is excepted under section 552.111, and it may not be withheld on that basis.

Lastly, we note that some of the submitted information may be 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 copyrighted. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; *see* Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, 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. As no further exceptions to disclosure are raised, the representative's office must release the submitted information; however, any information subject to copyright may be released only in accordance with copyright law.

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,



Sean Nottingham  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

SN/eb

Ref: ID# 500005

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)