



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

December 20, 2007

Mr. Anthony J. Sadberry
Executive Director
Texas Lottery Commission
P.O. Box 16630
Austin, Texas 78761-6630

OR2007-16884

Dear Mr. Sadberry:

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# 296571.

The Texas Lottery Commission (the "commission") received a request for "all reports, memos, emails, and policy recommendations and analyses and records relating to the possible privatization of the Texas Lottery."¹ You state that you have released some of the requested information. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107, 552.111, and 552.137 of the Government Code. You also state that the submitted information may be excepted under section 552.110 of the Government Code, but take no position as to whether this information is excepted under this section. You state, and provide documentation showing, that you notified the interested third parties of the commission's receipt of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments

¹The commission sought and received a clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 31 (1974) (when presented with broad requests for information rather than for specific records, governmental body may advise requestor of types of information available so that request may be properly narrowed).

to this office as to why the requested information should not be released to the requestor.² *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in the Act in certain circumstances). We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

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 “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)-(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).

²The commission notified the following parties: GTECH Corporation (“GTECH”); Merrill Lynch; Scientific Games International (“Scientific Games”); UBS Securities (“UBS”); Morgan Stanley; Macquarie Securities (USA) Inc. (“Macquarie”); Lehman Brothers, Inc. (“Lehman”); and Goldman, Sachs, & Co. (“Goldman Sachs”).

You explain that the information you have marked under section 552.107 consists of confidential communications between commission staff and commission attorneys made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services. You also inform us that the confidentiality of these communications has been maintained. Based on your arguments and our review of this information, we find that the information we have marked consists of privileged attorney-client communications that the commission may withhold under section 552.107. You have failed to demonstrate how the remaining information at issue constitutes privileged attorney-client communications. Accordingly, it may not be withheld on that basis.

Next, we address your argument under section 552.111 of the Government Code, which 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 this exception 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, and opinions that reflect 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 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). Furthermore, section 552.111 does not protect facts and written observations of facts and events that are severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *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 also has 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.

You assert that some of the information at issue reflects the “advice, recommendations, and opinions of [commission] officials and employees... that reflect policymaking decisions relating to the commission.” After reviewing the information at issue, we agree that the majority of this information consists of preliminary drafts that represent the advice, opinions, and recommendations of commission personnel. However, we find that some of the information at issue consists of purely factual information that is not excepted under section 552.111. Accordingly, with the exception of the information we have marked for release, the commission may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Section 552.137 excepts from disclosure “an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body” unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). *See* Gov’t Code. § 552.137(a)-(c). The marked e-mail addresses do not appear to be a type specifically excluded by section 552.137 (c). You state that the members of the public whose e-mail addresses appear in the remaining submitted information have not affirmatively consented to the release of these e-mail addresses. Therefore, the commission must withhold the e-mail addresses that you have marked, as well as the additional e-mail addresses we have marked, under section 552.137 of the Government Code.

We now address the third party arguments for the remaining submitted information. We note that an interested third party is allowed ten business days from the date of its receipt of the governmental body’s notice under section 552.305 of the Government Code to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should not be released. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this decision, this office has received no correspondence from Morgan Stanley, Lehman, or Goldman Sachs explaining how the release of the submitted information will affect their proprietary interests. In addition, Scientific Games has informed this office that it does not object to the release of its information. Thus, we have no basis to conclude that the release of any portion of the submitted information would implicate their proprietary interests. *See 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. Accordingly, none of the submitted information may be withheld

based on the proprietary interests of Morgan Stanley, Lehman, Scientific Games, or Goldman Sachs.

We also note GTECH has submitted information to this office that it asserts is excepted from release under section 552.110 of the Government Code; however, the commission did not submit this information for our review. This ruling does not address information beyond what the commission has submitted to us for review. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body requesting decision from attorney general must submit copy of specific information requested). Accordingly, this ruling is limited to the information the commission submitted as responsive to the request for information. *See id.*

GTECH claims that portions of its information should be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code. Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." *Id.* § 552.101. However, GTECH does not cite to any specific law that makes any portion of its information confidential under section 552.101. Therefore, we conclude that the commission may not withhold any portion of GTECH'S information under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

UBS, Merrill Lynch, Macquarie, and GTECH claim that portions of each company's information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110 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 id.* § 552.110(a), (b). Section 552.110(a) protects the property interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. *See id.* § 552.110(a). A "trade secret":

may consist of any formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is used in one's business, and which gives [one] 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, as for example the amount or other terms of a secret bid for a contract or the salary of certain employees A trade secret is a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business. Generally it relates to the production of goods, as for example, a machine or formula for the production of an article. It may, however, 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 Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763, 776 (Tex. 1958); Open Records Decision Nos. 255 (1980), 232 (1979), 217 (1978).

There are six factors to be assessed in determining whether information qualifies as a trade secret:

- (1) the extent to which the information is known outside of [the company's] business;
- (2) the extent to which it is known by employees and others 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 to [its] competitors;
- (5) the amount of effort or money expended by [the company] in developing this information; and
- (6) the ease or difficulty with which the information could be properly acquired or duplicated by others.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see also* ORD 232. This office must accept a claim that information subject to the Act is excepted as a trade secret if a *prima facie* case for exemption is made and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. ORD 552. However, we cannot conclude that section 552.110(a) is applicable unless it has been shown that the information meets the definition of a trade secret and the necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish a trade secret claim. 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.* § 552.110(b); *see also National Parks & Conservation Ass’n v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974).

Merrill Lynch, Macquarie, and GTECH claim that portions of their information are excepted from public disclosure under section 552.110 (a) as trade secrets. Upon review, we find that Merrill Lynch, Macquarie, and GTECH have failed to demonstrate that any of the

information at issue meets the definition of a trade secret or demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim. Accordingly, the commission may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. Further, we find that UBS, Merrill Lynch, Macquarie, and GTECH have failed to provide specific factual evidence demonstrating that release of the remaining submitted information would result in substantial competitive harm to each company. Accordingly, we determine that none of the remaining submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(b). *See* Open Records Decision No. 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).

Merrill Lynch also raises section 552.131 of the Government Code. Section 552.131 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.

(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. Section 552.131(a) excepts from disclosure only "trade secret[s] of [a] business prospect" and "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." *Id.* This aspect of section 552.131 is co-extensive with section 552.110 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.110(a)-(b). Merrill Lynch has failed to explain how any of the remaining submitted information consists of economic development negotiations that relate to a trade secret or commercial or financial information involving it and the commission. *See id.* § 552.131. Accordingly, we conclude that the commission may not withhold any portion of the remaining submitted information pursuant to section 552.131(a) of the Government Code. Furthermore, we note that

section 552.131(b) is designed to protect the interest of governmental bodies, not third parties. As the commission does not seek to withhold any information pursuant to section 552.131(b), we find this section does not apply to the information at issue, and it may not be withheld on that basis. Accordingly, no portion of the remaining submitted information is excepted under section 552.131(b) of the Government Code.

In summary, the commission may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.107 of the Government Code. Except for the information we have marked for release, the commission may also withhold the information it has marked, under section 552.111. The commission must withhold the marked e-mail addresses pursuant to section 552.137 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.

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 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,



Paige Savoie
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

PS/ma

Ref: ID# 296571

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Nelson D. Schwartz
The New York Times
628 8th Avenue, 2nd Floor
New York, New York 10018
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Ramon Rivera
GTECH Corporation
8200 Cameron Road, Suite #120
Austin, Texas 78754-382
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Matt Evans
Assistant Director
Macquarie Securities (USA) Inc.
125 West 55th Street
New York, NY 10019

Ms. Christine Walsh
Managing Director
Office of General Counsel
Merrill Lynch
4 World Financial Center FL 09
New York, New York 10080
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Pam Lee
Scientific Games International
1500 Bluegrass Lakes Parkway
Alpharetta, Georgia 30004
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Mitchell Gold
UBS Securities
1285 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10019
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Ajay Thomas
Vice President of Public Finance
Morgan Stanley
6300 Bridgepoint Parkway, #250
Austin, Texas 78730
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Bradley Tusk
Senior Vice President
Lehman Brothers Inc.
399 Park Avenue, 16th Floor
New York, New York 10022
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Leon Bijou
Vice President
Assistant General Counsel
Goldman, Sachs & Co.
One New York Plaza, 38th Floor
New York, New York 10004
(w/o enclosures)