



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

June 12, 2014

Mr. Brett Norbraten  
Open Records Attorney  
Texas Department of Aging and Disability Services  
P.O. Box 149030  
Austin, Texas 78714-9030

OR2014-10129

Dear Mr. Norbraten:

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# 525741 (Department ID Nos. 2014SOLEG0046, 0048).

The Texas Department of Aging and Disability Services (the "department") received two requests for all emails, attachments, and memoranda sent from and to eight named individuals that include certain phrases during a specified time period. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>1</sup>

Initially, we note portions of the submitted information, which we have marked, are not responsive to the instant request because they either were created outside of the time period specified in the request or were not sent from or to the named individuals. This ruling does not address the public availability of any information not responsive to the this request, and the department need not release it in response to the request.

---

<sup>1</sup>We assume 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 552.101 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. Section 552.101 encompasses section 595.001 of the Health and Safety Code, which provides:

Records of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a person that are maintained in connection with the performance of a program or activity relating to mental retardation are confidential and may be disclosed only for the purposes and under the circumstances authorized under Sections 595.003 and 595.004 [of the Health and Safety Code].

Health & Safety Code § 595.001. You state the submitted information in Exhibit A pertains to the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, and treatment of clients of the state supported living centers, which constitute mental retardation programs in the State of Texas. You also state the release provisions in sections 595.003 and 595.004 are inapplicable here. Based on your representations and our review, we agree the responsive information you marked, in addition to the information we have marked, is confidential under section 595.001 of the Health and Safety Code. Accordingly, we conclude the department must withhold the marked responsive information in Exhibit A under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 595.001 of the Health and Safety Code.

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 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 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, orig. proceeding). 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 e-mail communications were exchanged between attorneys for and employees of the department in order to facilitate the rendition of legal services. Additionally, you state an attachment to a responsive email consists of a report issued by an ongoing legal contractor of the department. Finally, you explain these communications were intended to be, and have remained, confidential. After reviewing your arguments and the information in Exhibit B, we agree the responsive information constitutes privileged attorney-client communications. Therefore, the department may withhold the responsive information in Exhibit B under section 552.107 of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup>

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, writ ref’d n.r.e.); *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)*.

---

<sup>2</sup>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 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 the information you have marked consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations of department employees and consultants relating to the department's policy. You also state the information at issue contains draft documents. You state the draft documents will be released to the public in final form. Based on your representations and our review, we find the department may withhold the responsive 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 responsive information in Exhibit C may not be withheld under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

We note the remaining responsive information contain personal e-mail addresses subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code. Section 552.137 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 subject to subsection 552.137(c). *Id.* § 552.137(c). Accordingly, the department must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked in Exhibit A under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure.

In summary, the department must withhold the marked responsive information in Exhibit A under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 595.001 of the Health and Safety Code. The department may withhold the responsive information in Exhibit B under section 552.107 of the Government Code. The department may also withhold the responsive information we have marked in Exhibit C under section 552.111 of the Government Code. Finally, the department must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked in Exhibit A under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure. 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.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,



Lee Seidlits  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CLS/tch

Ref: ID# 525741

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)