



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

August 22, 2012

Ms. Sharon Alexander
Associate General Counsel
Texas Department of Transportation
125 East Eleventh Street
Austin, Texas 78701-2483

OR2012-13303

Dear Ms. Alexander:

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# 463040.

The Texas Department of Transportation (the "department") received two requests from the same requestor for e-mail communications between several named individuals, specified call records and text messages, and information pertaining to a specified investigation.¹ You state you are releasing some of the requested information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.107, 552.111,

¹We note the department received clarification from the requestor regarding the requests. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (stating if information requested is unclear to governmental body or if large amount of information has been requested, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify or narrow request, but may not inquire into purpose for which information will be used); *see also* *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380 (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).

and 552.117 of the Government Code.² We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.³

Initially, you note some of the responsive information was the subject of a previous request for information, in response to which this office issued Open Records Letter No. 2012-11745 (2012). In that ruling, we held the department must withhold the information we had marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and release the remaining information at issue. We have no indication the law, facts, or circumstances on which this prior ruling was based have changed. Accordingly, we conclude the department must continue to rely on this ruling as a previous determination and withhold or release the previously ruled upon information in accordance with Open Records Letter No. 2012-11745. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 at 6-7 (2001) (so long as law, facts, 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).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public 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, which protects information that (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. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). Common-law privacy encompasses the specific types of information held to be intimate or embarrassing in *Industrial Foundation*. *See id.* at 683 (information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs). This office has found some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses are excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps). Additionally, this office has found personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545 (1990) (deferred

²Although you also raise Texas Rule of Evidence 503, we note that, in this instance, 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 1-2 (2002).

³We 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 those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

compensation information, participation in voluntary investment program, election of optional insurance coverage, mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history). However, this office has noted the public has a legitimate interest in information that relates to public employees and their conduct in the workplace. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 562 at 10 (1990) (personnel file information does not involve most intimate aspects of human affairs but in fact touches on matters of legitimate public concern), 470 at 4 (job performance does not generally constitute public employee's private affairs), 444 at 3 (1986) (public has obvious interest in information concerning qualifications and performance of government employees), 405 at 2 (1983) (manner in which public employee's job was performed cannot be said to be of minimal public interest), 329 (1982). We find the information we have marked is highly intimate or embarrassing information and of no legitimate public concern. Accordingly, the department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find the remaining information consists of information in which there is a legitimate public interest or information that is not highly intimate or embarrassing. Therefore, the department may not withhold any of the remaining information on the basis of section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.102 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwanted 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. *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 Third 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 expressly disagreed with *Hubert's* interpretation of section 552.102(a) and held its privacy standard differs from the *Industrial Foundation* test under section 552.101. *See Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). The supreme court then considered the applicability of section 552.102, and held section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *See id.* at 347-48. Upon review, we find no portion of the information at issue is subject to section 552.102(a), and the department may not withhold any of the submitted information on that basis.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information that comes 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 Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002)*. First, a governmental body must demonstrate 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. *See 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. *See 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. *See* 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. *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).

You claim Exhibit E is protected by section 552.107 of the Government Code. You state Exhibit E consists of or documents communications involving department attorneys, department staff, and the Attorney General’s Office in its capacity as a representative of the department, that were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the department. You state these communications were intended to be confidential and you have maintained their confidentiality. You have identified the parties to the communications. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information in Exhibit E. Accordingly, the department may withhold Exhibit E under section 552.107 of the Government Code.⁴

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. Section 552.111 encompasses information protected by civil discovery privileges. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 647 at 3 (1996), 251 at 2-4 (1980)*. You contend the information submitted in Exhibit D is excepted from disclosure under section 552.111 because it would be privileged from

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

discovery under section 409 of title 23 of the United States Code. Section 409 provides as follows:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, reports, surveys, schedules, lists, or data compiled or collected for the purpose of identifying, evaluating, or planning the safety enhancement of potential accident sites, hazardous roadway conditions, or railway-highway crossings, pursuant to sections 130, 144, and 152 of this title or for the purpose of developing any highway safety construction improvement project which may be implemented utilizing Federal-aid highway funds shall not be subject to discovery or admitted into evidence in a Federal or State court proceeding or considered for other purposes in any action for damages arising from any occurrence at a location mentioned or addressed in such reports, surveys, schedules, lists, or data.

23 U.S.C. § 409. Federal courts have stated that section 409 excludes from evidence data compiled for purposes of highway and railroad crossing safety enhancement and construction for which a state receives federal funding, in order to facilitate candor in administrative evaluations of highway safety hazards and to prevent federally required record-keeping from being used for purposes of private litigation. *See Harrison v. Burlington N. R.R.*, 965 F.2d 155, 160 (7th Cir. 1992); *Robertson v. Union Pac. R.R.*, 954 F.2d 1433, 1435 (8th Cir. 1992); *see also Pierce County v. Guillen*, 123 S.Ct. 720 (2003) (upholding constitutionality of 23 U.S.C. § 409, relied on by county in denying request under state's Public Disclosure Act).

You inform us the highways at issue in Exhibit D are part of the National Highway System under section 103 of title 23 of the United States Code and thus are federal-aid highways for the purposes of section 409 of title 23. You state the information at issue was compiled for highway safety purposes. You contend the information at issue would be privileged from discovery in civil litigation under section 409 and is therefore excepted from disclosure under section 552.111 of the Government Code. Based on your representations, we conclude the department may withhold Exhibit D under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Section 552.117 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home address and telephone number, emergency contact information, social security number, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who timely request this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. Gov't Code § 552.117(a). 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)*. Thus, information may only be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee 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. We note section 552.117 is also applicable to personal cellular telephone numbers, provided the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a

governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-6 (1988) (section 552.117 not applicable to cellular telephone numbers paid for by governmental body and intended for official use). The remaining information contains information subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code, which we have marked. You state the employees to whom the information relates timely elected to keep such information confidential. Thus, the department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117 of the Government Code except that cellular telephone numbers may be withheld only if the cellular service is not paid for by the department. However, none of the remaining information constitutes the home address and telephone number, emergency contact information, social security number, or family member information of a current or former official or employee of the department. Accordingly, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code.

In summary, the department must continue to rely on Open Records Letter No. 2012-11745 as a previous determination and withhold or release the previously ruled upon information in accordance with that ruling. The department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The department may withhold Exhibit E under section 552.107 of the Government Code and Exhibit D under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117 of the Government Code except that cellular telephone numbers may be withheld only if the cellular service is not paid for by the department. The department must release the remaining information

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.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php, 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 must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Paige Lay
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

PL/tch

Ref: ID# 463040

Enc. Submitted documents

**c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)**