



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 24, 2016

Ms. Jessica Vu  
Assistant General Counsel  
Office of Governor Greg Abbott  
P.O. Box 12428  
Austin, Texas 78711

OR2016-06729

Dear Ms. Vu:

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# 602680 (OOG ID# 15-525 & DPS PIR# 16-0369).

The Office of the Governor (the "governor's office") received a request for multiple categories of information pertaining to the settlement of Syrian refugees in Texas. You state you have released some information to the requestor. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107 and 552.111 of the Government Code. You also inform us you have notified the Texas Department of Public Safety (the "department"), the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, and the U.S. Department of State of their rights to submit comments to this office as to why the requested information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit written comments regarding availability of requested information). We have received comments from the department. We have also received and considered comments from the requestor. *See id.* We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>1</sup>

---

<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 those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. *See 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. *See* 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 “to facilitate 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)(A), (B), (C), (D), (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: (A) to whom disclosure is made to further the rendition of professional legal services to the client; or (B) reasonably necessary to transmit 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 information you have marked consists of communications involving attorneys for the governor’s office and governor’s office employees in their capacities as clients. You also state some of the communications involve attorneys for the governor’s office and attorneys with the Office of the Attorney General, which you inform us is a privileged party with respect to these communications. You state these communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the governor’s office. You state these communications were intended to be, 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 at issue. Accordingly, the governor’s office may

withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107(1) 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. 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, 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, 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 that a preliminary draft of a document that is 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,

---

<sup>2</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

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.

You assert the remaining information you have marked consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations relating to policymaking of the governor's office. You further state the information at issue includes draft documents that will be released to the public in its final form. Upon review, we find the governor's office may withhold the remaining information you have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

The department claims some of the remaining information is subject to section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code, which excepts from disclosure “[a]n internal record or notation of a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that is maintained for internal use in matters relating to law enforcement or prosecution . . . if (1) release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.108(b)(1). This section is intended to protect “information which, if released, would permit private citizens to anticipate weaknesses in a police department, avoid detection, jeopardize officer safety, and generally undermine police efforts to effectuate the laws of this State.” *City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320, 327 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.). This office has concluded this provision protects certain kinds of information, the disclosure of which might compromise the security or operations of a law enforcement agency. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 at 3-4 (1989) (detailed guidelines regarding police department’s use of force policy), 508 at 3-4 (1988) (information relating to future transfers of prisoners), 413 (1984) (sketch showing security measures for forthcoming execution). However, to claim this aspect of section 552.108 protection a governmental body must meet its burden of explaining how and why release of the information at issue would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. Open Records Decision No. 562 at 10 (1990). Further, commonly known policies and techniques may not be withheld under section 552.108. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 at 2-3 (former section 552.108 does not protect Penal Code provisions, common-law rules, and constitutional limitations on use of force), 252 at 3 (1980) (governmental body did not meet burden because it did not indicate why investigative procedures and techniques submitted were any different from those commonly known with law enforcement and crime prevention). To prevail on its claim that section 552.108(b)(1) excepts information from disclosure, a law-enforcement agency must do more than merely make a conclusory assertion that releasing the information would interfere with law enforcement. The determination of whether the release of particular records would interfere with law enforcement is made on a case-by-case basis. Open Records Decision No. 409 at 2 (1984).

The department explains revealing the records it has marked under section 552.108(b)(1) would provide criminals with “invaluable” information concerning border security and intelligence strategies concerning terrorism. Upon review, we find the department has demonstrated release of a portion of the information at issue, which we have marked, would interfere with law enforcement. Thus, the governor’s office may withhold the information

we have marked under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup> However, the department has failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue would interfere with law enforcement. Accordingly, none of the remaining information at issue may be withheld under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses sections 418.177 of the Texas Homeland Security Act (the “HSA”), chapter 418 of the Government Code. Sections 418.176 through 418.182 were added to chapter 418 as part of the HSA. These provisions make certain information related to terrorism confidential. Section 418.177 provides that information is confidential if it:

- (1) is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental entity for the purpose of preventing, detecting, or investigating an act of terrorism or related criminal activity; and
- (2) relates to an assessment by or for a governmental entity, or an assessment that is maintained by a governmental entity, of the risk or vulnerability of persons or property, including critical infrastructure, to an act of terrorism or related criminal activity.

*Id.* § 418.177. The fact that information may be related to a governmental body’s security concerns, biological toxins, or emergency preparedness does not make such information *per se* confidential under the HSA. *See* Open Records Decision No. 649 at 3 (1996) (language of confidentiality provision controls scope of its protection). Furthermore, the mere recitation by a governmental body of a statute’s key terms is not sufficient to demonstrate the applicability of a claimed provision. As with any exception to disclosure, a governmental body asserting one of the confidentiality provisions of the HSA must adequately explain how the responsive records fall within the scope of the claimed provision. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must explain how claimed exception to disclosure applies).

The department raises section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.177 of the Government Code for some of the remaining information. Upon review, we find the department has failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue is confidential under section 418.177 of the Government Code. Therefore, the remaining information at issue may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.177 of the Government Code.

---

<sup>3</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the department’s remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, emergency contact information, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. *Id.* § 552.117(a)(1). The department raises section 552.117(a)(1) for a portion of the remaining information. However, section 552.117(a)(1) is applicable only to information a governmental body holds in an employment context. Upon review, we find the governor's office does not maintain the information at issue in an employment capacity. Therefore, the governor's office may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.117 of the Government Code.

Section 552.1175 of the Government Code protects the home address, home telephone number, emergency contact information, date of birth, social security number, and family member information of certain individuals, when that information is held by a governmental body in a non-employment capacity and the individual elects to keep the information confidential.<sup>4</sup> *Id.* § 552.1175(b). Section 552.1175 applies, in part, to "peace officers as defined by Article 2.12, Code of Criminal Procedure[.]" *Id.* § 552.1175(a)(1). Some of the remaining information pertains to an individual whose information may be subject to section 552.1175. However, we are unable to determine from the information provided whether the individual at issue is currently a licensed peace officer. Thus, we must rule conditionally. Accordingly, to the extent the information at issue, which we have marked, relates to an individual who is currently a licensed peace officer and who elects to restrict access to the information in accordance with section 552.1175(b), the governor's office must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.1175 of the Government Code. Conversely, if the individual whose information is at issue is not currently a licensed peace officer or does not elect to restrict access to this information in accordance with section 552.1175(b), the governor's office may not withhold the information we have marked under section 552.1175.

In summary, the governor's office may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The governor's office may withhold the remaining information you have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The governor's office may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code. To the extent the information at issue, which we have marked, relates to an individual who is currently a licensed peace officer and who elects to restrict access to the information in accordance with section 552.1175(b), the governor's office must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.1175 of the Government Code. The governor's office must release the remaining information.

---

<sup>4</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).

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,



Joseph Keeney  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JDK/dls

Ref: ID# 602680

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Molly Cost  
Assistant General Counsel  
Texas Department of Public Safety  
P.O. Box 4087  
Austin, Texas 78773  
(w/o enclosures)

Tony Tucker  
U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
c/o Ms. Jessica Vu  
Assistant General Counsel  
Office of Governor Greg Abbott  
P.O. Box 12428  
Austin, Texas 78711  
(w/o enclosures)

Office of Information Programs and Services  
U.S. Department of State  
c/o Ms. Jessica Vu  
Assistant General Counsel  
Office of Governor Greg Abbott  
P.O. Box 12428  
Austin, Texas 78711  
(w/o enclosures)