



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

April 25, 2007

Ms. Margo Kaiser  
Staff Attorney  
Texas Workforce Commission  
101 East 15<sup>th</sup> St.  
Austin, Texas 78778-0001

OR2007-04676

Dear Ms. Kaiser:

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# 276718.

The Texas Workforce Commission (the "commission") received two requests for information related to RFO # 2006-2581, Unemployment Insurance Benefits, Debit Card Services. You state that a portion of the responsive information will be released to the requestors. You claim a portion of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107, 552.111, and 552.117 of the Government Code. Additionally, you claim that this information may be subject to the proprietary interests of ACS, Automated Data Processing, Inc ("ADP"), and JP Morgan Chase Bank ("Chase"). You inform us, and provide documentation indicating, that you notified these companies of the request and of each company's opportunity to submit comments to this office. *See Gov't Code § 552.305* (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); 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 in certain circumstances). We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that 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, ACS, ADP, and Chase have not submitted to this office any reasons explaining why their information should not be released. We thus have no basis for concluding that any portion of the submitted information constitutes these companies' proprietary information, and none of it may be withheld on that basis. *See, e.g., id.* § 552.110; Open Records Decision Nos. 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), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3 (1990).

Next, we must address the commission's obligations under the Act. Pursuant to section 552.301(e), the governmental body must, within fifteen business days of receiving the request, submit to this office (1) written comments stating the reasons why the stated exceptions apply that would allow the information to be withheld, (2) a copy of the written request for information, (3) a signed statement or sufficient evidence showing the date the governmental body received the written request, and (4) a copy of the specific information requested or representative samples, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the documents. Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A)-(D). You inform us that the commission received the second request on February 9, 2007. Thus, the fifteenth business day after the commission received the second request was March 5, 2007. However, the commission submitted "additional documents" for Exhibit D on March 6, 2007 that it claims are excepted by section 552.111 of the Government Code. Consequently, the commission did not submit these additional documents within fifteen business days and, thus, failed to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 with regard to this information.

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 information is public and must be released. Information that is presumed public must be released unless a governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information to overcome this presumption. *See Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to section 552.302); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). A compelling reason exists when third-party interests are at stake, or when information is confidential under other law. Open Records Decision No. 150 (1977).

Although you raise section 552.111 of the Government Code for the additional documents, this exception is discretionary in nature and serves only to protect a governmental body's interests and may be waived. As such, section 552.111 does not constitute a compelling reason to withhold information for purposes of section 552.302. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 663 at 5 (1999) (governmental body may waive section 552.111), 470 (1987) (statutory predecessor to section 552.111 is discretionary exception); *see also* Open Records Decision

No. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions in general). Accordingly, the commission may not withhold the additional documents pursuant to section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, you also claim a portion of the additional documents is subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code. Because the applicability of section 552.117 can provide a compelling reason to withhold information from disclosure, we will consider your arguments under this exception as well as under the exceptions you raised for the timely submitted information.

You claim the information submitted as Exhibit E is excepted under section 552.107 of the Government Code. Section 552.107(1) protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. Gov't Code § 552.107(1). 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 “for the purpose of facilitating 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 to whom disclosure is made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client or those reasonably necessary for the transmission of 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, no writ). 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).

You state that Exhibit E constitutes confidential communications between and among attorneys and employees of the commission made for the purpose of rendering professional legal services. You further state that the confidentiality of these communications has been maintained. Based on your arguments and our review of Exhibit E, we agree that this information may be withheld under section 552.107(1).

You claim the timely submitted information in Exhibit D is excepted by section 552.111 of the Government Code. Section 552.111 excepts from public disclosure “an 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. Section 552.111 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, no writ); 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 that 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* Open Records Decision No. 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. The 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 that are severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *See* Open Records Decision No. 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 that a preliminary draft of a document that is 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.

Further, section 552.111 can encompass communications between a governmental body and a third party consultant. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 631 at 2 (section 552.111 encompasses information created for governmental body by outside consultant acting at governmental body's request and performing task that is within governmental body's authority), 561 at 9 (1990) (section 552.111 encompasses communications with party with which governmental body has privity of interest or common deliberative process), 462 at 14 (1987) (section 552.111 applies to memoranda prepared by governmental body's consultants). For section 552.111 to apply in such instances, 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* Open Records Decision No. 561 at 9.

You contend that the Exhibit D information at issue is protected by the deliberative process privilege and excepted from disclosure under section 552.111. You state that this information was "all prepared for the purpose of advising the executive leadership of [the commission] on the issue of award of the proposal regarding the Unemployment Insurance Debit Card Project." Upon review of your arguments and the Exhibit D information at issue, we conclude that a portion of the submitted information consists of advice, opinions, recommendations, and drafts regarding policymaking matters of the commission that may be withheld under section 552.111. However, we note that some of the information at issue was shared with third parties with which you have not demonstrated the commission shares a privity of interest or common deliberative process. Furthermore, we find that some of the information at issue consists of severable factual information that is not excepted under section 552.111. We have marked the information that may be withheld pursuant to section 552.111.

You claim a portion of the remaining information pertaining to a commission employee in Exhibit D is excepted by section 552.117 of the Government Code. Section 552.117(a)(1) excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024. Whether a particular piece of information is protected by section 552.117 must be determined at the time the request for it is made. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). You state the commission employee at issue made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for this information was made. Accordingly, the commission must withhold the information you have marked pursuant to section 552.117.

We note that the remaining information contains private e-mail addresses.<sup>1</sup> 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). We note that section 552.137 does not apply to a government employee’s work e-mail address because such an address is not that of the employee as a “member of the public” but is instead the address of the individual as a government employee. The e-mail addresses we have marked are not of a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c) of the Government Code. Therefore, the commission must withhold the marked e-mail addresses in accordance with section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the commission receives consent for its release.

Finally, we note that a portion of the submitted information has notice of copyright protection. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). A governmental body must allow inspection of materials that are subject to copyright protection unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.* 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 550 (1990).

In summary, the commission may withhold Exhibit E pursuant to section 552.107 of the Government Code. The commission may withhold the information we have marked in Exhibit D pursuant to section 552.111 of the Government Code. The commission must withhold the information in Exhibit D that you have marked under section 552.117 of the Government Code, and the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code. The remaining submitted information must be released to the requestor, but any copyrighted information may only be released in accordance with copyright law.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov’t Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by

---

<sup>1</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Office of the Attorney General at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Holly R. Davis  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

HRD/eeg

Ref: ID# 276718

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Mary B. Lewis  
Treasury Sales  
JP Morgan Chase  
221 West 6<sup>th</sup> Street, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Austin, Texas 78701  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Naomi Marr  
Vice President  
Government and Community Solutions  
ACS  
1800 M Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20036  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Laurie Eldridge  
Vice President and General Manager  
National Account Services  
Automatic Data Processing, Inc.  
13141 Northwest Freeway  
Houston, Texas 77040  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Susan Kim  
Assistant Corporate Counsel  
Government Solutions  
ACS  
1800 M Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20036  
(w/o enclosures)