KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 23, 2015

Ms. Sarah Parker
Associate General Counsel
Texas Department of Transportation
125 East 11th Street
Austin, Texas 78701-2483

OR2015-14983

Dear Ms. Parker:

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# 570728.

The Texas Department of Transportation (the "department") received a request for information pertaining to a high-speed rail route from Harris County to Dallas County, excluding news clips, over a specified time period.[1] You claim portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. Additionally, you state release of some of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of Texas Central High-Speed Railway, L.L.C. ("TCR").[2] Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation demonstrating, you notified TCR of the request and of the company's right to submit arguments to this office as to why the requested information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also*

[1]You state the department sought and received clarification of the information requested. *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 that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or over-broad request for public information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

[2]We note the department did not comply with section 552.301(e) of the Government Code in requesting this decision for Exhibit G. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e). Nevertheless, because the interests of third parties can provide a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness, we will consider whether or not Exhibit G is excepted from disclosure under the Act. *See id.* §§ 552.007, .302, .352.

Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under the Act in certain circumstances). We have received comments from TCR. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.[3] We have also received and considered comments from the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (providing an interested party may submit documents stating why information should or should not be released).

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. Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate that 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 a 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. *Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, orig. proceeding). Moreover, because the client may elect to waive the privilege at any time, a governmental body must explain that 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).

---

[3]We 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.

You claim Exhibit B consists of communications between the department attorneys, and department employees and employees of the Federal Railroad Administration (the "administration"). You inform us the department is working together with the administration as joint lead agencies in preparing an environmental impact statement for the proposed high-speed rail route as required by the National Environmental Policy Act. *See* 40 C.F.R. 1505.15(b). You state the submitted communications were sent for the purpose of seeking and providing confidential legal advice. You further state these communications have not been disclosed to any third parties. Based on your representations and our review, we find the department may generally withhold Exhibit B under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.[4] However, some of the otherwise-privileged e-mail strings include e-mails received from or sent to non-privileged third parties. We find these e-mails are separately responsive. Therefore, if these non-privileged e-mails, which we have marked, are maintained by the department separate and apart from the otherwise-privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then the department may not withhold them 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, 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).

---

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

This office has also concluded section 552.111 exempts from disclosure a preliminary draft of a document intended for public release in its final form because the draft necessarily represents the drafter's advice, opinion, and recommendation with regard to the form and content of the final document. *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 of a preliminary draft of a policymaking document, including comments, underlining, deletions, and proofreading marks, that will be released to the public in its final form. *See id.* at 2.

You state Exhibit C consists of advice, opinion, and recommendations pertaining to department policies. Further, you inform us some of the communications at issue involve the administration and consultants, with which the department shares a privity of interests with regard to the matters at issue. Additionally, you state some of this information consists of draft documents which you state were intended to be released to the public in their final forms. Upon review, we find the department may withhold the submitted draft documents and e-mail attachments in Exhibit C, with the exception of those we have marked for release, under section 552.111 of the Government Code. Further, we find the information we have marked in the submitted e-mails consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations pertaining to policymaking matters. Accordingly, the department may withhold the information we have marked in the submitted e-mails in Exhibit C under section 552.111. However, we find the remaining information at issue consists of general administrative or factual information. Thus, we find you have failed to demonstrate how the remaining information at issue is excepted under section 552.111 on the basis of the deliberative process privilege, and the department may not withhold any of the remaining information in Exhibit C 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). Upon review, we find the information we have marked in Exhibit D meets the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the department must withhold the information we have marked in Exhibit D under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find none of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing information of no legitimate public interest. Thus, the department may not withhold any of

the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

TCR claims portions of its responsive information are excepted under section 552.110 of the Government Code, which protects (1) trade secrets, and (2) commercial or financial information, the disclosure of which would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110. Section 552.110(a) protects trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. *Id.* § 552.110(a). The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of trade secret from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts. *See Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex. 1957); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 552 (1990). Section 757 provides that a trade secret is:

> any formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is used in one's business, and which gives him an opportunity to obtain an advantage over competitors who do not know or use it. It may be a formula for a chemical compound, a process of manufacturing, treating or preserving materials, a pattern for a machine or other device, or a list of customers. It differs from other secret information in a business . . . in that it is not simply information as to single or ephemeral events in the conduct of the business . . . . A trade secret is a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business. . . . [It may] relate to the sale of goods or to other operations in the business, such as a code for determining discounts, rebates or other concessions in a price list or catalogue, or a list of specialized customers, or a method of bookkeeping or other office management.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see also Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776. In determining whether particular information constitutes a trade secret, this office considers the Restatement's definition of trade secret as well as the Restatement's list of six trade secret factors.[5] RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b. This office must accept a claim that information subject to the Act is excepted as a trade secret if a *prima facie* case for the exception is made and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. *See* ORD 552 at 5. However, we cannot conclude section 552.110(a) is applicable unless it has been shown the information meets the definition of a trade secret and the necessary

---

[5]The Restatement of Torts lists the following six factors as indicia of whether information constitutes a trade secret:

> (1) the extent to which the information is known outside of [the company];
> (2) the extent to which it is known by employees and other involved in [the company's] business;
> (3) the extent of measures taken by [the company] to guard the secrecy of the information;
> (4) the value of the information to [the company] and [its] competitors;
> (5) the amount of effort or money expended by [the company] in developing the information;
> (6) the ease or difficulty with which the information could be properly acquired or duplicated by others.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b; *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

factors have been demonstrated to establish a trade secret claim. *See* Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

Section 552.110(b) protects "[c]ommercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that disclosure would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained[.]" Gov't Code § 552.110(b). This exception to disclosure requires a specific factual or evidentiary showing, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the information at issue. *Id.*; *see also* Open Records Decision 661 at 5-6 (1999) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm).

TCR explains portions of its information pertaining to ridership projections and associated cost estimates consist of financial and commercial information, the release of which would cause substantial competitive harm under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. Upon review, we find TCR has demonstrated the information we have marked would result in substantial harm to its competitive position. *See* ORD 661 (for information to be withheld under commercial or financial information prong of section 552.110, business must show by specific factual evidence that substantial competitive injury would result from release of particular information at issue). Accordingly, the department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b).[6]

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).[7] *See* Gov't Code § 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). Upon review, we find the department must withhold the e-mail addresses of members of the public in the remaining information under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless their owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure or section 552.137(c) applies.

We note some of the remaining information appears to be subject to copyright law. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish

---

[6]As our ruling is dispositive, we do not address TCR's remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

[7]The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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 department may generally withhold Exhibit B under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. However, if the non-privileged e-mails, which we have marked, exist separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail string in which they appear, then the department may not withhold the non-privileged e-mails under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code and must release the non-privileged e-mails. The department may withhold the submitted draft documents and e-mail attachments, with the exception of the e-mail attachments we have marked for release, as well as the information we have marked in the submitted e-mails in Exhibit C under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The department must withhold the information we have marked in Exhibit D under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. The department must withhold the e-mail addresses of members of the public in the remaining information under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless their owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure or section 552.137(c) applies. The department must release the remaining information; however, any information protected by copyright may only be released 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 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,

Abigail T. Adams

Abigail T. Adams
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

ATA/bhf

Ref: ID# 570728

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Texas Central High-Speed Railway
c/o Mr. Derek McDonald
Baker Botts
98 San Jacinto Boulevard, Suite 1500
Austin, Texas 78701
(w/o enclosures)