



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 4, 2017

Mr. R. Brooks Moore
Deputy General Counsel
The Texas A&M University System
301 Tarrow Street, 6th Floor
College Station, Texas 77840-7896

OR2017-17641

Dear Mr. Moore:

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# 669609 (Ref. No. R000924-051517).

Texas A&M University (the "university") received a request for (1) all e-mails, including attachments, sent by five named employees during a specified time period and (2) all e-mails, including attachments, sent by a sixth named employee to the five named employees during a specified time period. You claim portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

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 exception encompasses information protected by other statutes,

¹We 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.

including section 418.176 of the Texas Homeland Security Act (the "HSA"), chapter 418 of the Government Code. Section 418.176 provides, in relevant part:

(a) Information is confidential if the information is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental entity for the purpose of preventing, detecting, responding to, or investigating an act of terrorism or related criminal activity and:

(1) relates to the staffing requirements of an emergency response provider, including a law enforcement agency, a fire-fighting agency, or an emergency services agency[.]

Id. § 418.176(a)(1). The fact that information may generally be related to emergency preparedness does not make the information *per se* confidential under the provisions of the HSA. *See* Open Records Decision No. 649 at 3 (1996) (language of confidentiality provision controls scope of its protection). As with any confidentiality statute, a governmental body asserting this section must adequately explain how the responsive information falls within the scope of the provision. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must explain how claimed exception to disclosure applies). You state the information at issue pertains to law enforcement agencies which were "investigating potential criminal activity and taking certain actions to enhance the personal safety of [a university] employee," and was used for the purpose of "coordinating with the university's police department and a local municipal police department." Thus, you assert some of the information at issue was "collected, assembled, or maintained for the purpose of preventing, detecting, responding to, or investigating criminal activity." Further, we understand you to assert some of the submitted information relates to the staffing requirements of the university's police department and the local municipal police department. Based on these representations and our review, we find the university has demonstrated the information we marked relates to staffing requirements of a law enforcement agency. Therefore, the university must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.176 of the Government Code. However, we find the university has failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 418.176 to any portion of the remaining information, and the university may not withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) 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. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. Upon review, we find no portion of the information at issue is highly intimate or

embarrassing and of no legitimate public concern, and the university may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of common-law privacy.

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. *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 “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 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. *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 state the information you marked consists of communications between university attorneys and employees that were made for the purpose of providing legal services to the university. You state the communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find the information you marked consists of privileged attorney-client communications. Therefore, the university may withhold the information you marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

We note some of the remaining information may be subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code.² Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home address and telephone number, emergency contact information, social security number, and family member information of a current or former employee or official of a governmental body who requests this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). Whether a particular item of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. *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 or official 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 or official who did not timely request under section 552.024 the information be kept confidential. Therefore, to the extent the employee at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the university must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. Conversely, to the extent the employee at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024, the university may not withhold the information under section 552.117(a)(1).

In summary, the university must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.176 of the Government Code. The university may withhold the information you marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. To the extent the employee at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the university must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. 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, or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for

²The 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 No. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Emily Kunst". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Emily Kunst
Attorney
Open Records Division

EK/eb

Ref: ID# 669609

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)