



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 13, 2017

Ms. Jessica Escobar
Assistant General Counsel
Texas Department of Agriculture
P.O. Box 12847
Austin, Texas 78711

OR2017-28324

Dear Ms. Escobar:

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# 687513 (TDA PIR 18-104).

The Texas Department of Agriculture (the "department") received a request for all correspondence sent or received by three named department officials during a specified period of time. You state the department will release some information. You claim portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, 552.111, and 552.139 of the Government Code, as well as privileged under Texas Rules of Evidence 503. We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample information.¹

Initially, we note some of the submitted information, which we marked, is not responsive to the instant request because it was created outside the date range specified in the request. This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the

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.

request and the department is not required to release such information in response to this request.²

Next, we must address the department's procedural obligations under section 552.301 of the Government Code when requesting a decision from this office under the Act. Pursuant to section 552.301(b), within ten business days after receiving a written request the governmental body must request a ruling from this office and state the exceptions to disclosure that apply. Gov't Code § 552.301(b). You state the department received the request for information on September 25, 2017. Accordingly, the department's ten-business-day deadline was October 9, 2017. Although you timely requested a ruling from this office, you did not raise section 552.103 of the Government Code until after the ten-business-day deadline passed. Consequently, we find the department failed to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 of the Government Code in raising this exception.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless there is a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ). By failing to timely raise section 552.103 of the Government Code, we find the department has failed to establish a compelling reason to address its claims under this section. Consequently, the department may not withhold any of the responsive information at issue under section 552.103 of the Government Code. However, we will consider the applicability of the timely raised exceptions.

We also note some of the submitted responsive information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides, in relevant part:

(a) [T]he following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

...

(17) information that is also contained in a public court record; and

(18) a settlement agreement to which a governmental body is a party.

²As we are able to make this determination, we need not address your arguments against disclosure for this information.

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(17)-(18). The submitted responsive information contains a court-filed document that is subject to section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code. The submitted responsive information also includes a settlement agreement, to which the department is a party, that is subject to section 552.022(a)(18) of the Government Code. This information must be released unless it is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* § 552.022. As you raise no exceptions to exceptions to disclosure for the information subject to section 552.022(a)(17), this information, which we have marked, must be released. You seek to withhold the information subject to section 552.022(a)(18) under section 552.107 of the Government Code. However, section 552.107 is discretionary in nature and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 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).* Therefore, the settlement agreement may not be withheld under section 552.107 of the Government Code. However, we note the Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Evidence are "other law" within the meaning of section 552.022. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). We will therefore consider your assertion of the attorney-client privilege under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence for the information subject to section 552.022(a)(18). We will also consider your argument under section 552.107 against disclosure of the information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code.

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 the settlement agreement subject to section 552.022(a)(18) of the Government Code, which is an attachment to an e-mail communication, is a privileged attorney-client communication involving attorneys for the department and department officials. You state the communication was made in confidence for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the department and this communication has remained confidential. Based on this representation and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Therefore, the department may generally withhold the attachment under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. However, we note the otherwise privileged attachment was received from or sent to a non-privileged party. Furthermore, if the attachment received from or sent to the non-privileged party is removed from the otherwise privileged e-mail string in which it appears and stands alone, it is responsive to the request for information. Therefore, if the department maintains the non-privileged attachment, which we have marked, separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail string in which it appears, then it may not withhold the non-privileged attachment under rule 503.

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 in Exhibit D not subject to section 552.022(a)(18) of the Government Code consists of communications involving attorneys for the department and department officials. You state the communications were made in confidence for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the department 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 department may withhold the information in Exhibit D not subject to section 552.022(a)(18) under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

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)*.

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 at issue consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations regarding policy making decisions between and among department employees and officials. You also state some of the information at issue includes draft documents which you state were released in their final forms. Based on your representations and our review, we find the department may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, upon review, we find the remaining information at issue consists of information that is administrative or purely factual in nature or a communication with an individual the department failed to demonstrate shares a privity of interest. Thus, the department may not withhold any portion of the remaining information at issue under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

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. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). Further, we note the public generally has a legitimate interest in information relating to public employment and public

employees. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 562 at 10 (1990) (personnel file information does not involve most intimate aspects of human affairs, but in fact touches on matters of legitimate public concern), 470 (1987) (public employee's job performance does not generally constitute employee's private affairs), 444 (1986) (public has legitimate interest in knowing reasons for dismissal, demotion, promotion, or resignation of public employee), 423 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow). Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate any portion of the information in Exhibit H is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, no portion of Exhibit H may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

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.³ *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 department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the marked cellular telephone numbers may be withheld only if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone services. Conversely, to the extent the individuals at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024, the department may not withhold the marked information under section 552.117(a)(1).

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). *See* Gov't

³The Office of the Attorney General will raise 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).

Code § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail address at issue does not appear to be the type specifically excluded by subsection (c). Upon review, we find the department must withhold the personal e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner affirmatively consents to its public disclosure.

In summary, the department may withhold the information we have marked under Texas Rule of Evidence 503; however, if the department maintains the non-privileged attachment separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail string in which it appears, then it may not withhold the non-privileged attachment on that ground. The department may withhold the information in Exhibit D not subject to section 552.022(a)(18) of the Government Code under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The department may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 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 department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the marked cellular telephone numbers may be withheld only if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone services. The department must withhold the personal e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner affirmatively consents to its public disclosure. The department must release the remaining responsive 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,



Jahna Ward
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JW/tdw

Ref: ID# 687513

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)