



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 19, 2017

Ms. Cary D. Kirby
County Attorney
Angelina County
P.O. Box 1845
Lufkin, Texas 75902-1845

OR2017-28821

Dear Ms. Kirby:

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# 689114 (ORR# R1).

Angelina County (the "county") received a request for all e-mails sent from a named individual during a specified time period.¹ The county states it has released some information. The county claims some of the submitted information is not subject to the Act. Additionally and in the alternative, the county claims some of the submitted information is

¹You state the county sought and received clarification of the request for information. See Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (stating if information requested is unclear to governmental body or if large amount of information has been requested, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify or narrow request, but may not inquire into purpose for which information will be used); *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380 (Tex. 2010) (holding when governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification of unclear or overbroad request for public information, ten-business-day period to request attorney general opinion is measured from date request is clarified or narrowed).

excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.107, 552.109, 552.117, 552.136, and 552.137.² We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.³

The county contends some of the submitted information is not subject to the Act. The Act is applicable only to “public information.” *See* Gov’t Code §§ 552.002, .021. Section 552.002(a) defines “public information” as information that is written, produced, collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business:

- (1) by a governmental body;
- (2) for a governmental body and the governmental body:
 - (A) owns the information;
 - (B) has a right of access to the information; or
 - (C) spends or contributes public money for the purpose of writing, producing, collecting, assembling, or maintaining the information; or
- (3) by an individual officer or employee of a governmental body in the officer’s or employee’s official capacity and the information pertains to official business of the governmental body.

Id. § 552.002(a). Information is “in connection with the transaction of official business” if it is “created by, transmitted to, received by, or maintained by an officer or employee of the governmental body in the officer’s or employee’s official capacity, or a person or entity performing official business or a government function on behalf of a governmental body, and pertains to official business of the governmental body.” *Id.* § 552.002(a-1). Thus, virtually

²Although you do not raise section 552.107 of the Government Code in your brief, we understand the county to assert this exception based on the substance of your arguments. We also note the county did not comply with section 552.301 of the Government Code in requesting this decision. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.301(b). Nonetheless, because sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.107, 552.109, 552.117, 552.136, and 552.137 of the Government Code can provide compelling reasons to overcome the presumption of openness, we will consider the applicability of these sections to the submitted information. *See id.* §§ 552.007, .302, .352.

³We 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.

all the information in a governmental body's physical possession constitutes public information and is subject to the Act. *Id.*; see Open Records Decision Nos. 549 at 4 (1990), 514 at 1-2 (1988).

You contend Exhibit G is not public information as defined by section 552.002. You assert the communications at issue are purely personal in nature and do not relate to county business. Based on your representations and our review, we find Exhibit G does not constitute public information for purposes of section 552.002 of the Government Code. *Cf.* Open Records Decision No. 635 at 7 (1995) (section 552.002 not applicable to personal information unrelated to official business and created or maintained by state employee involving *de minimis* use of state resources). Therefore, Exhibit G is not subject to the Act and need not be released to the requestor.⁴

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

⁴As our ruling for this information is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against its disclosure.

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 Exhibit H consists of a communication between the county attorney and a county employee in his capacity as a client. You state this communication was made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the county. We understand the communication was intended to be confidential and has remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find Exhibit H consists of a privileged attorney-client communication. Therefore, the county may withhold Exhibit H under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts “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. We note the names of members of the public are generally not highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 551 at 3 (1990) (disclosure of person's name, address, or telephone number not an invasion of privacy), 455 at 7 (home addresses and telephone numbers not protected under privacy). Upon review, we find the remaining information is either not highly intimate and embarrassing or is of legitimate public interest. Therefore, the county may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

You assert some of the remaining information is subject to section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. Section 552.102(a) 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). We understand you to assert the privacy analysis under section 552.102(a) is the same as the common-law privacy test under section 552.101 of the Government Code. As previously mentioned, common-law privacy protects information if it (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. In *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Texas Newspapers, Inc.*, 652 S.W.2d 546, 549-51 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref’d n.r.e.), the court of appeals ruled the privacy test under section 552.102(a) is the same as the *Industrial Foundation* privacy test. However, the Texas Supreme Court has expressly disagreed with *Hubert’s*

interpretation of section 552.102(a) and held the privacy standard under section 552.102(a) differs from the *Industrial Foundation* test under section 552.101. *Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336, 348 (Tex. 2010). The Texas Supreme Court also considered the applicability of section 552.102(a) and held it excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *See id.* at 348. Upon review, we find none of the remaining information is subject to section 552.102(a) and it may not be withheld on that basis.

Section 552.109 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[p]rivate correspondence or communications of an elected office holder relating to matters the disclosure of which would constitute an invasion of privacy[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.109. This office has held the test to be applied to information under section 552.109 is the same as the common-law privacy standard under section 552.101, as discussed above. *Indus. Found.* 540 S.W.2d at 682. Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information constitutes highly intimate or embarrassing information that is of no legitimate concern to the public. Therefore, the county may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.109 of the Government Code.

Section 552.117(a)(1) 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, however, section 552.117 only protects the information of a current or former employee or official of a governmental body held by the governmental body in an employment context. The county has failed to demonstrate the applicability of this section to any portion of the remaining information and thus, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code on that basis.

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.” *Id.* § 552.136(b). An access device number is one that may be used to 1) obtain money, goods, services, or another thing of value, or 2) initiate a transfer of funds other than a transfer originated solely by a paper instrument, and includes an account number. *See id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). You inform us the submitted coordinator ID number is a federal identification number used “to access, obtain[,] and transfer federal grants and funds to which the county is entitled.” Based on these representations, we find the county must withhold the coordinator ID number you marked under section 552.136 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). *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 the personal e-mail addresses within the remaining information at issue, which are located within e-mails communicating official business of the county, belong to one of the categories described in section 552.137(c). Further, we are unable to determine whether the personal e-mail addresses you marked belong to government employees or officials. Thus, we rule conditionally. To the extent the e-mail addresses within the remaining information are the personal e-mail addresses of county 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 county 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, Exhibit G is not subject to the Act and need not be released to the requestor. The county may withhold Exhibit H under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The county must withhold the coordinator ID number you marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. To the extent the personal e-mail addresses you marked are not the personal e-mail addresses of government officials or employees and subsection (c) does not apply, the county must withhold the e-mail addresses you marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners of the e-mail addresses affirmatively consent to their release. The county 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 "Kael A. Henze". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Kaelan A. Henze
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KAH/gw

Ref: ID# 689114

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)