



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 9, 2020

Mr. Joseph Behnke
Assistant General Counsel
Office of the Governor of the State of Texas
P.O. Box 12428
Austin, Texas 78711

OR2020-17131

Dear Mr. Behnke:

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# 835163 (OOG ID Nos. 197-20, 205-20, 207-20, 210-20, and 217-20).

The Office of the Governor (the "governor's office") received five requests from different requestors for various categories of communications involving the governor's office.¹ We understand the governor's office will withhold access device numbers pursuant to section 552.136(c) of the Government Code.² The governor's office claims some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, 552.111, and 552.137 of the Government Code and may be protected by copyright law.³ The governor's office also states it notified interested third parties of the request for information and of their rights to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released), .305; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits

¹ We note the governor's office sought and received clarification of two of the requests. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also* *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (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).

² Section 552.136(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 552.136(b) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See* Gov't Code § 552.136(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.136(e). *See id.* § 552.136(d), (e).

³ Although the governor's office does not raise section 552.137 of the Government Code or copyright law in its brief, we understand the governor's office to raise these arguments based on its markings.

governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in the Act in certain circumstances). We have received comments from the Texas Department of Public Safety and Abbott Laboratories, Inc. (“Abbott Labs”). We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.⁴

Initially, we note an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body’s notice under section 552.305(d) to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received comments from any of the remaining third parties explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude any of the remaining third parties has a protected proprietary interest in the submitted information, and the governor’s office may not withhold any portion of it on that basis. *See, e.g., id.* § 552.110 (requiring the provision of specific factual evidence demonstrating the applicability of the exception).

Next, the governor’s office informs us some of the requested information was the subject of previous requests for information, as a result of which this office issued Open Records Letter Nos. 2020-14833 (2020), 2020-15234 (2020), 2020-15328 (2020), 2020-16329 (2020), 2020-16346 (2020), and 2020-16612 (2020). We have no indication the law, facts, or circumstances on which the prior rulings were based have changed. Accordingly, the governor’s office must continue to rely on Open Records Letter Nos. 2020-14833, 2020-15234, 2020-15328, 2020-16329, 2020-16346, and 2020-16612 as previous determinations and withhold or release the submitted information in accordance with those rulings. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (so long as law, facts, and circumstances on which prior ruling was based have not changed, first type of previous determination exists where requested information is precisely same information as was addressed in prior attorney general ruling, ruling is addressed to same governmental body, and ruling concludes that information is or is not excepted from disclosure). To the extent the submitted information was not subject to the prior rulings, we will address the submitted arguments against disclosure.

We note the submitted information includes court-filed documents. Section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code provides for required public disclosure of “information that is also contained in a public court record[.]” unless the information is expressly made confidential under the Act or other law. Gov’t Code § 552.022(a)(17). Although the governor’s office seeks to withhold the court-filed document under sections 552.103 and 552.107 of the Government Code, these sections are discretionary exceptions to disclosure that protect a governmental body’s interests and do not make information confidential under the Act. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive Gov’t Code § 552.103); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 10-11 (2002)

⁴ 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 that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

(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 governor's office may not withhold the submitted court-filed documents under section 552.103 or section 552.107. However, the Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rule 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). Therefore, we will consider the governor's office's assertion of the attorney-client privilege under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 for the information subject to 552.022. We will also address the submitted arguments for the information not subject to 552.022 of the Government Code.

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

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).

The governor's office states the information subject to section 552.022 consists of attachments to communications between governor's office attorneys and employees that were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the governor's office. The governor's office states the communications were intended to be, and have remained, confidential. Upon review, we find the governor's office has established the information at issue constitutes privileged attorney-client communications under rule 503. Thus, the governor's office may withhold the information subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code under Texas Rule of Evidence 503.⁵

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 information made confidential by other statutes, such as section 81.046 of the Health and Safety Code, which provides, in part:

(a) Reports, records, and information received from any source, including from a federal agency or from another state, furnished to a public health district, a health authority, a local health department, or [DSHS] that relate to cases or suspected cases of diseases or health conditions are confidential and may be used only for the purposes of this chapter.

(b) Reports, records, and information relating to cases or suspected cases of diseases or health conditions are not public information under [the Act], and may not be released or made public on subpoena or otherwise except as provided by Subsections (c), (c-1), (d), and (f).

Health & Safety Code § 81.046(a)-(b). In Open Records Decision No. 577 (1990), this office concluded that any information acquired or created during an investigation under chapter 81 of the Health and Safety Code is confidential and may not be released unless an exception set out in the statute applies. *See id.* § 81.046(b)-(d), (f); ORD 577. The governor's office and Abbott Labs state some of the information at issue relates to cases or suspected cases of contagious diseases, and thus, section 81.046 governs the release of the information at issue. Based on these representations and our review, we agree section 81.046 governs the release of this information. Additionally, the governor's office and Abbott Labs state none of the release provisions of section 81.046 are applicable in this instance. Accordingly, we determine the governor's office must withhold the information it marked and the additional information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 81.046 of the Health and Safety Code.⁶

⁵ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

⁶ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. Gov't Code § 552.107(1). The elements of the privilege under section 552.107(1) are the same as those discussed above for rule 503. 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.

The governor's office states the information it marked consists of communications between governor's office attorneys and employees that were made for the purpose of providing legal services to the governor's office. The governor's office states the communications were intended to be, and have remained, confidential. Based on the governor's office's representations and our review, we find the information at issue consists of privileged attorney-client communications. Therefore, the governor's office may withhold the information it marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.⁷

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information that is made confidential by sections 418.176 and 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 418.176 of the HSA 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; [or]

(2) relates to a tactical plan of the provider; Or

(3) consists of a list or compilation of pager or telephone numbers, including mobile and cellular telephone numbers of the provider.

Gov't Code § 418.176(a)(1)-(3). 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

⁷ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

(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 relate to a governmental body's security concerns does not make the 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 governor's office states the information it marked reveals staffing requirements, tactical plans of emergency response providers in relation to operations at the border, and reveals possible vulnerabilities related to the border. Further, the governor's office argues release of the information it marked could aid terrorists and other criminals in avoiding detection and in the commission of crimes against critical infrastructure related to the state's international border. Based on the governor's office's representations and our review, we find the information it marked relates to staffing requirements and tactical plans of emergency response providers maintained by the governor's office for the purpose of preventing, detecting, responding to, or investigating an act of terrorism or related criminal activity. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 542 (1990) (stating that governmental body has burden of establishing that exception applies to requested information), 532 (1989), 515 (1988), 252 (1980). Accordingly, the governor's office must withhold the information it marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with sections 418.176 and 418.177 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. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). Upon review, we find the information the governor's office marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the governor's office must withhold the information it marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

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.

The governor's office states the information it marked consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations of governor's office employees and officials and employees of other agencies with whom the governor's office states it shares a privity of interest regarding policymaking matters. The governor's office further states some of the information at issue consists of draft documents that were intended to be released in their final forms. Upon review, we find the governor's office may withhold the information it marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code.⁸

We note the governor's office has marked some information subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code for redaction pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).⁹ 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). Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). Section 552.137 is not applicable to an institutional e-mail address, the general e-mail address of a business, an Internet website address, 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 that a governmental entity maintains 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). Further, section 552.137 does not apply to the private e-mail addresses of government officials who use their private e-mail addresses to conduct official government business. *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)). Upon review, with the exception of the e-mail addresses we have marked for release, the governor's office must withhold the e-mail addresses it has marked under section 552.137, unless the owners of the addresses affirmatively consent to their release.

The governor's office notes some of the materials at issue may be protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; *see* Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit.

In summary, the governor's office must continue to rely on Open Records Letter Nos. 2020-14833, 2020-15234, 2020-15328, 2020-16329, 2020-16346, and 2020-16612 as previous determinations and withhold or release the requested information in accordance

⁸ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

⁹ Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information, including personal e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision. *See* ORD 684.

with those rulings. The governor's office may withhold the information subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. The governor's office must withhold the information it marked and the additional information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 81.046 of the Health and Safety Code. The governor's office may withhold the information it marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The governor's office must withhold the information it marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with sections 418.176 and 418.177 of the Government Code. The governor's office must withhold the information it marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The governor's office may withhold the information it marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. With the exception of the e-mail addresses we have marked for release, the governor's office must withhold the e-mail addresses it has marked under section 552.137, unless the owners of the addresses affirmatively consent to their release. The governor's office must release the remaining information; however, any information that is subject to copyright may be released only in accordance with copyright law.

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 <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open-government/members-public/what-expect-after-ruling-issued> or call the OAG's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Public Information Act may be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the OAG, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

Gerald A. Arismendez
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

GAA/eb

Ref: ID# 835974

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 5 Requestors
(w/o enclosures)

2 Third Parties
(w/o enclosures)