



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 7, 2016

Mr. Ryan D. Pittman
Counsel for the City of Wylie
Abernathy, Roeder, Boyd & Hullett, P.C.
P.O. Box 1210
McKinney, Texas 75070-1210

OR2016-20147

Dear Mr. Pittman:

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# 625469.

The City of Wylie (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for all e-mails sent to and from two named individuals during a specified time period. You indicate you will redact e-mail addresses subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code pursuant to the previous determination in Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).¹ You claim some of the submitted information is not subject to the Act. Alternatively, you claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.105, 552.107, 552.109, and 552.131 of the Government Code.² We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

¹Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination authorizing all governmental bodies to withhold certain categories of information, including e-mail addresses of members of the public subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

²Although you also raise Texas Rule of Evidence 503, we note the proper exception to raise when asserting the attorney-client privilege for information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code is section 552.107 of the Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 677 (2002), 676 at 1-2 (2002). Additionally, although you also raise section 552.002 of the Government Code, we note section 552.002 is not an exception to disclosure. Section 552.002 is a provision of the Act that defines "public information" for purposes of the Act. *See* Gov't Code § 552.002. Furthermore, although you also raise section 552.023 of the Government Code, we note section 552.023 is not an exception to public disclosure under the Act. *See id.* § 552.023 ("person's authorized representative has a special right of access, beyond the right of the general public, to information held by a governmental body that relates to the person and that is protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect that person's privacy interests").

Initially, we note some of the submitted information, which you marked and we marked, is not responsive to the present request because it does not fall within the specified time period. This ruling does not address the public availability of the non-responsive information and the city need not release it in response to this request.

We note 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.

(a-1) Information is in connection with the transaction of official business if the information 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 governmental function on behalf of a governmental body, and pertains to official business of the governmental body.

(a-2) The definition of “public information” provided by Subsection (a) applies to and includes any electronic communication created, transmitted, received, or maintained on any device if the communication is in connection with the transaction of official business.

Id. § 552.002(a)-(a-2). Thus, virtually 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). The city asserts some of the submitted information consists of e-mails that are purely personal in nature. The city further states the

information at issue was not collected, assembled, or maintained regarding the transaction of official city business. Based on these representations and our review, we find the information we marked does not constitute public information for purposes of the Act. Gov't Code § 552.002; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 635 at 4 (1995) (section 552.002 not applicable to personal information unrelated to official business and created or maintained by state employee involving no or *de minimis* use of state resources). Therefore, the information we marked is not subject to the Act, and the city is not required to release it in response to this request.³ However, we find the remaining responsive information relates to the transaction of the official business of the city. Thus, we find the remaining responsive information is subject to the Act and the city must release it unless the information falls within an exception to public disclosure under the Act. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.006, .021, .301, .302.

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 common-law privacy. 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. v. Texas 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 established. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. However, upon review, we find the city has failed to demonstrate the responsive information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public interest. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the responsive information 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). You 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, which is discussed above. *See 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. *See Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts*, 354 S.W.3d 336. The 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 no

³Because we are able to make this determination, we need not consider your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

portion of the responsive information is subject to section 552.102(a) of the Government Code, and the city may not withhold any of the information at issue on that basis.

Section 552.105 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information relating to:

- (1) the location of real or personal property for a public purpose prior to public announcement of the project; or
- (2) appraisals or purchase price of real or personal property for a public purpose prior to the formal award of contracts for the property.

Gov't Code § 552.105. We note this provision is designed to protect a governmental body's planning and negotiating position with regard to particular transactions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 564 (1990), 357 (1982), 310 (1982). Information that is excepted from disclosure under section 552.105 that pertains to such negotiations may be excepted from disclosure so long as the transaction relating to that information is not complete. *See* ORD 310. Under section 552.105, a governmental body may withhold information "which, if released, would impair or tend to impair [its] 'planning and negotiating position in regard to particular transactions.'" ORD 357 at 3 (quoting Open Records Decision No. 222 (1979)). The question of whether specific information, if publicly released, would impair a governmental body's planning and negotiating position with regard to particular transactions is a question of fact. Accordingly, this office will accept a governmental body's good-faith determination in this regard, unless the contrary is clearly shown as a matter of law. *See* ORD 564.

You generally state section 552.105 applies to some of the responsive information. However, we find you have not demonstrated any of the information at issue pertains to the location, appraisal, or purchase price of real or personal property for a public purpose. *See* ORD 310 (statutory predecessor to section 552.105 protects information relating to the location, appraisals, and purchase price of property to be purchased by governmental body for public purpose). Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.105 of the Government Code.

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* ORD 676 at 6-7. 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 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).

Although you generally assert some of the responsive information consists of privileged communications involving city employees and city attorneys, you have not provided any arguments demonstrating any of the information at issue constitutes confidential communications between privileged parties made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services. *See Gov’t Code* § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must explain how claimed exception to disclosure applies). Thus, we find you have failed to establish that the attorney-client privilege is applicable to the responsive information. Accordingly, no portion of the information at issue may be withheld under section 552.107 of the Government Code.

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[.]” *Id.* § 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 of the Government Code, as discussed above. *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate any of the responsive information constitutes highly intimate or embarrassing information that is of no legitimate concern to the public. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the responsive information under section 552.109 of the Government Code.

We note some of the remaining information may be subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code.⁴ 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)*. Section 552.117(a)(1) also applies to the personal cellular telephone number of a current or former official or employee of a governmental body, provided the cellular telephone service is not paid by a governmental body. *See Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-6 (1988)*. 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 employees at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the city may only withhold the marked cellular telephone numbers if the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. Conversely, to the extent the employees at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024, the city may not withhold the information under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.131 of the Government Code relates to economic development information and provides, in part:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if the information relates to economic development negotiations involving a governmental body and a business prospect that the governmental body seeks to have locate, stay, or expand in or near the territory of the governmental body and the information relates to:

(1) a trade secret of the business prospect; or

(2) commercial 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.

⁴The 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)*.

(b) Unless and until an agreement is made with the business prospect, information about a financial or other incentive being offered to the business prospect by the governmental body or by another person is excepted from [required public disclosure].

Gov't Code § 552.131 (a)-(b). Section 552.131 (a) protects the proprietary interests of third parties that have provided information to governmental bodies, not the interests of governmental bodies themselves. There has been no demonstration by a third party that any of the information at issue constitutes a trade secret or that release of any of the information at issue would cause a third party substantial competitive harm. *See* Open Record Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999), 552 at 5 (1990). Thus, the city may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.131(a) of the Government Code.

Section 552.131(b) of the Government Code protects information about a financial or other incentive that is being offered to a business prospect by a governmental body or another person. Gov't Code § 552.131(b). You state some of the remaining responsive information is related to a pending business projects or prospects. However, upon review, we find no portion of the information at issue pertains to a financial or other incentive offered to a business prospect by a governmental body or another person. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining responsive information under section 552.131(b) of the Government Code.

You indicate you will redact information under section 552.137 of the Government Code, which 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 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). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the e-mail addresses you marked and redacted in the remaining responsive information under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless their owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure or subsection (c) applies.

We note some of the remaining responsive information appears to 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 information we marked is not subject to the Act, and the city is not required to release it in response to this request. To the extent the employees at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the city may only withhold the marked cellular telephone numbers if the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. The city must withhold the e-mail addresses you marked and redacted in the remaining information under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless their owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure or subsection (c) applies. The city must release the remaining responsive information; however, any information subject to 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,



Ashley Crutchfield
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

AC/dls

Ref: ID# 625469

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)