



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 29, 2017

Ms. Julie Allen
Interim General Counsel
Office of the General Counsel
Texas Alcoholic Beverage Commission
P.O. Box 13127
Austin, Texas 78711-3127

OR2017-22362

Dear Ms. Julie Allen:

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# 677644 (PIR Reference No. 1176866891).

The Texas Alcoholic Beverage Commission (the "commission") received a request for specified communications involving named individuals during a specified period of time. You state you will release some information. You state portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.103, 552.107, 552.111, 552.117, 552.1175, 552.130, 552.136, and 552.137 of the Government Code. You also state portions of the submitted information are privileged under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence and rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

Initially, note some of the submitted information consists of a completed report, which we marked, subject to section 552.022(a)(1) of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a)(1)

¹We 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.

provides for the required disclosure of “a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body,” unless it is excepted by section 552.108 of the Government Code or made confidential under the Act or other law. Gov’t Code § 552.022(a)(1). You raise sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code for portions of this information. However, sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 are discretionary exceptions and do not make information confidential under the Act. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 479, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body waive Gov’t Code § 552.103); Open Records Decision Nos. 677 at 8 (2002) (attorney work product privilege under section 552.111 may be waived), 676 at 10-11 (2002) (attorney-client privilege under Gov’t Code § 552.107(1) may be waived), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Accordingly, the commission may not withhold any portion of the completed report under section 552.103, section 552.107, or section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, the Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Evidence and Texas Rules of Civil Procedure are “other law” within the meaning of section 552.022. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328 (Tex. 2001). Therefore, we will consider the applicability of rule 503 and rule 192.5 for the completed report subject to section 552.022(a)(1). Additionally, we will consider the commission’s arguments for the remaining information not subject to section 552.022(a)(1).

Texas Rule of Evidence 503(b)(1) provides:

A client has a privilege to refuse to disclose and to prevent any other person from disclosing confidential communications made to facilitate the rendition of professional legal services to the client:

- (A) between the client or the client’s representative and the client’s lawyer or the lawyer’s representative;
- (B) between the client’s lawyer and the lawyer’s representative;
- (C) by the client, the client’s representative, the client’s lawyer, or the lawyer’s representative to a lawyer representing another party in a pending action or that lawyer’s representative, if the communications concern a matter of common interest in the pending action;
- (D) between the client’s representatives or between the client and the client’s representative; or
- (E) among lawyers and their representatives representing the same client.

TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). A communication is “confidential” if not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made to further the rendition of professional legal services to the client or reasonably necessary to transmit the communication. *Id.* 503(a)(5).

Accordingly, in order to withhold attorney-client privileged information from disclosure under rule 503, a governmental body must 1) show that the document is a communication transmitted between privileged parties or reveals a confidential communication; 2) identify the parties involved in the communication; and 3) show that the communication is confidential by explaining that it was not intended to be disclosed to third persons and that it was made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client. *See* ORD 676. Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the entire communication is confidential under rule 503, provided the client has not waived the privilege or the communication does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in rule 503(d). *Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein); *In re Valero Energy Corp.*, 973 S.W.2d 453, 457 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1998, orig. proceeding) (privilege attaches to complete communication, including factual information).

You assert portions of the information subject to section 552.022(a)(1) consist of privileged attorney-client communications. You explain the information at issue was communicated between attorneys for the commission and a commissioner for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the commission. You state the information at issue was intended to be confidential and was not disclosed to non-privileged parties. Based on your representations and our review, we find the information at issue consists of communications protected by the attorney-client privilege. Accordingly, the commission may withhold the information you have marked in the information subject to section 552.022(a)(1) of the Government Code under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.²

Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5 encompasses the attorney work product privilege. For purposes of section 552.022 of the Government Code, information may be withheld under rule 192.5 only to the extent the information implicates the core work product aspect of the work product privilege. *See* ORD 677 at 9-10. Rule 192.5 defines core work product as the work product of an attorney or an attorney’s representative, developed in anticipation of litigation or for trial, that contains the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of the attorney or the attorney’s representative. *See* TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5(a), (b)(1). Accordingly, in order to withhold attorney core work product from disclosure under rule 192.5, a governmental body must demonstrate the material was (1) created for trial or in anticipation of litigation when the governmental body received the request for information,

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

and (2) consists of an attorney's or the attorney's representative's mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories. *Id.*

The first prong of the work product test, which requires a governmental body to show the information at issue was created in anticipation of litigation, has two parts. A governmental body must demonstrate (1) a reasonable person would have concluded from the totality of the circumstances surrounding the investigation that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue, and (2) the party resisting discovery believed in good faith that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue and conducted the investigation for the purpose of preparing for such litigation. *See Nat'l Tank v. Brotherton*, 851 S.W.2d 193, 207 (Tex. 1993). A "substantial chance" of litigation does not mean a statistical probability, but rather "that litigation is more than merely an abstract possibility or unwarranted fear." *Id.* at 204. The second prong of the work product test requires the governmental body to show the documents at issue contain the attorney's or the attorney's representative's mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories. *See* TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5(b)(1). A document containing core work product information that meets both prongs of the work product test may be withheld under rule 192.5, provided the information does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in rule 192.5(c). *See Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, orig. proceeding).

The commission contends some of the remaining information subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code constitutes attorney work product protected by rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. Upon review, we find you have not demonstrated any of the remaining information at issue consists of mental impressions, opinions, conclusion, or legal theories of an attorney or an attorney's representative that were created for trial or in anticipation of trial. *See Nat'l Tank*, 851 S.W.2d at 206 (information created in ordinary course of business constitutes work product if agency demonstrates primary motivating purpose for preparation of information was in anticipation of litigation); *see also* ORD 677 at 7. Therefore, the commission may not withhold any of the information at issue under rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

Next, we address your argument under section 552.107 for the information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. The elements of the privilege under section 552.107(1) are the same as those discussed above for rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. 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. ORD 676 at 6-7. 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*, 922 S.W.2d at 923.

You state the information at issue consists of communications between commission officials, commission attorneys, and privileged parties. You state the communications were made in confidence for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the commission and these communications 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. Thus, the commission may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.³

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, 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, 364 (Tex. 2000) (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking). A governmental body’s policymaking functions 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, 157 (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, section 552.111 protects the factual information. *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

³As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

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). When determining if an interagency memorandum is excepted from disclosure under section 552.111, we must consider whether the entities between which the memorandum is passed share a privity of interest or common deliberative process with regard to the policy matter at issue. *See id.* 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 argue the information you have marked consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations of the commission regarding policy making decisions, including draft reports and press releases. You state the draft documents have been released in their final form. Further, you state some of the information at issue consists of employment matters regarding the executive director and general counsel. You contend these are key personnel positions that “are unique to [the commission’s] ability to implement, execute, and enforce policies that broadly impact the agency’s mission and operational direction.” Some of the information at issue consists of communications with representatives of the Office of the Governor, with whom we understand the commission shares a privity of interest or common deliberative process. Based on these representations and our review of the information at issue, we find the commission may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code.⁴ However, we find the remaining information at issue is general administrative and purely factual information and does not pertain to policymaking. Further, some of the remaining information at issue consists of communications with an individual you have failed to demonstrate shares a privity of interest or common deliberative process with the commission. Thus, we find you have failed to show the remaining information at issue consists of internal communications containing advice, opinions, or recommendations on the policymaking matters of the commission. Accordingly, the commission may not withhold any portion of the remaining information at issue under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

⁴As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

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 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. This office has also found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision No. 545 (1990) (deferred compensation information, participation in voluntary investment program, election of optional insurance coverage, mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history). However, there is a legitimate public interest in the essential facts about a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body. *See id.* (financial information pertaining to receipt of funds from governmental body or debts owed to governmental body not protected by common-law privacy). Upon review, we find some of the remaining information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Thus, the commission must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.102(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.” Gov’t Code § 552.102(a). The Texas Supreme Court held section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts v. Attorney General of Texas*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). Thus, under *Texas Comptroller*, section 552.102(a) is applicable to the birth date of an employee of a governmental body in a record maintained by his or her employer in an employment context. Accordingly, the commission must withhold the employee’s date of birth you have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code.

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). We note section 552.117 is also applicable to personal cellular telephone numbers, provided the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-6 (1988) (section 552.117 not applicable to cellular telephone numbers paid for by governmental body and intended for official use). 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 individuals whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the commission must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the marked cellular telephone number may be withheld only if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service. Conversely, to the extent the individuals at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024, the commission may not withhold the marked information under section 552.117(a)(1).

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. Gov't Code § 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). Thus, to the extent the information at issue pertains to a licensed peace officer who elects to restrict access to his information in accordance with section 552.1175(b), the commission must withhold the information you have marked under section 552.1175 of the Government Code.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides, "[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential." § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining "access device"). Accordingly, the commission must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

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). *Id.* § 552.137(a)-(c). Section 552.137 does not apply to an institutional e-mail address, the general e-mail address of a business, an e-mail address of a person who has a contractual relationship with a governmental body, an e-mail address of a vendor who seeks to contract with a governmental body, an e-mail address maintained by a governmental entity for one of its officials or employees, or an e-mail address provided to a governmental body on a letterhead. *See id.* § 552.137(c). We are unable to determine whether some of the personal e-mail addresses within the remaining information at issue belong to city officials or employees. Thus, we rule conditionally. To the extent the e-mail addresses within the remaining information are

the personal e-mail addresses of commission officials or employees, or to the extent subsection (c) applies, this information is not subject to section 552.137 and may not be withheld on that basis. *See Austin Bulldog v. Leffingwell*, 490 S.W.3d 240 (Tex. App.—Austin 2016, no pet.) (holding personal e-mail addresses of government officials used to conduct official government business are not e-mail addresses of “members of the public” for purposes of Gov’t Code § 552.137(a)). However, to the extent the e-mail addresses within the remaining information are not the personal e-mail addresses of commission officials or employees and subsection (c) does not apply, this information is subject to section 552.137 and must be withheld under section 552.137, unless the owners of the e-mail addresses affirmatively consent to their release.

In summary, the commission may withhold the information you have marked in the information subject to section 552.022(a)(1) of the Government Code under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. The commission may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The commission may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The commission must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The commission must withhold the employee’s date of birth you have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. To the extent the individuals whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the commission must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the marked cellular telephone number may be withheld only if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service. The commission must withhold the information you have marked under section 552.1175 of the Government Code if it pertains to a licensed peace officer who elects to restrict access to his information in accordance with section 552.1175(b) of the Government Code. The commission must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. To the extent the e-mail addresses within the remaining information are not the personal e-mail addresses of commission officials or employees and subsection (c) does not apply, this information is subject to section 552.137 and must be withheld under section 552.137, unless the owners of the e-mail addresses affirmatively consent to their release. The commission must release the remaining information.

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

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, appearing to read 'Jahna Ward', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Jahna Ward
Attorney
Open Records Division

JW/tdw

Ref: ID# 677644

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)