



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 24, 2015

Ms. Elaine Nicholson
Assistant City Attorney
Law Department
City of Austin
P.O. Box 1088
Austin, Texas 78767-1088

OR2015-17618

Dear Ms. Nicholson:

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# 576884.

The City of Austin (the "city") received a request for information related to the Fixed Base Operator Lease and Development Agreement between the city and Advanced Services, Inc., d/b/a Jet Black Flight Services ("Jet Black") during a specified time period. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code. Additionally, you state release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of Jet Black. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified Jet Black of the request for information and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released. *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 received comments from Jet Black. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹ We have also received and considered comments from a representative for the requestor. *See Gov't Code § 552.304*

¹We 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.

(interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Initially, we note, and you acknowledge, the city has not complied with the time periods prescribed by section 552.301 of the Government Code with respect to a portion of the submitted information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301. When a governmental body fails to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301, the information at issue is presumed public and must be released unless there is a compelling reason to withhold it. *See id.* § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342, 350 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *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); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 630 (1994). Generally, a compelling reason may exist to withhold information when the information is made confidential by another source of law or affects third-party interests. *See* Open Records Decision No. 150 at 2 (1977). Because you inform us Jet Black's proprietary interests may be implicated, we will consider Jet Black's interest in withholding information at issue. Further, sections 552.101, 552.117, 552.136, and 552.137 of the Government Code can provide compelling reasons to overcome the presumption of openness.² Therefore, we will address the applicability of these exceptions to the information at issue. We will also consider your argument under section 552.107 of the Government Code against release of the information that was timely submitted.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. *See* 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 "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

²The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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).

You state the some of the submitted information consists of communications involving attorneys for the city and city employees and officials in their capacities as clients. You state these communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the city. You state these communications were intended to be, and have remained, confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue, which you have marked. Accordingly, the city may withhold the information you marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

We now turn to Jet Black’s arguments against release of the remaining information. Jet Black argues some of its information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code, which excepts from disclosure “information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder.” Gov’t Code § 552.104(a). A private third party may invoke this exception. *Boeing Co. v. Paxton*, No. 12-1007, 2015 WL 3854264 (Tex. June 19, 2015). The “test under section 552.104 is whether knowing another bidder’s [or competitor’s information] would be an advantage, not whether it would be a decisive advantage.” *Id.* at *9. Jet Black states it has competitors. In addition, Jet Black states release of its information regarding financing, management contracts, and development plans would give its competitors “a significant advantage, both as to this particular [l]ease, as well as other government contracts” because it would reveal details of its business plan, “including any potential hurdles that might make [Jet Black] vulnerable to its competition. After review of the information at issue and consideration of the arguments, we find Jet Black has established the release of the information at issue would give advantage to a competitor or bidder. Thus, we conclude the city may withhold the information at issue, which Jet Black has indicated, under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts “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. This office has found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 545 (1990) (common-law privacy protects mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history), 523 (1989) (common-law privacy protects credit reports, financial statements, and other personal financial information), 373 (1983) (sources of income not related to financial transaction between individual and governmental body protected under common-law privacy). Upon review, we find some of the remaining information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the city must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

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). 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). 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. The remaining information contains cellular telephone numbers of city employees. Therefore, to the extent the employees whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code and a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service, the city must withhold the cellular telephone numbers we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. Conversely, to the extent the individuals at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024 or a governmental body pays for the cellular telephone service, the city may not withhold the marked information under section 552.117(a)(1).

Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides, "Notwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential." Gov't Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining "access device"). This office has determined insurance policy numbers are access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136.

Accordingly, the city must withhold the routing, bank account, and insurance policy numbers within the remaining documents under section 552.136 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 id.* § 552.137(a)-(c). Section 552.137 is not applicable to an institutional e-mail address, an Internet website address, or an e-mail address that a governmental entity maintains for one of its officials or employees. Under section 552.137, a governmental body must withhold the e-mail address of a member of the general public, unless the individual to whom the e-mail address belongs affirmatively consents to its public disclosure. *See id.* § 552.137(b). Because we are unable to discern whether the e-mail addresses within the responsive documents fall within the scope of section 552.137(c), we must rule conditionally. To the extent the e-mail addresses we have noted are not excluded by subsection 552.137(c) of the Government Code, the city must withhold such e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the individuals to whom the e-mail addresses belong affirmatively consent to their release. *See id.* § 552.137(b). However, to the extent the e-mail addresses at issue are excluded by subsection 552.137(c), the e-mail addresses may not be withheld under section 552.137 of the Government Code.

We note some of the materials at issue may 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 city may withhold the information you marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The city may withhold the information Jet Black indicated under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. To the extent the employees whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code and a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service, the city must withhold the cellular telephone numbers we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the routing, bank account, and insurance policy numbers within the remaining documents under section 552.136 of the Government Code. To the extent the e-mail addresses we have noted are not excluded by subsection 552.137(c) of the Government Code, the city must withhold such e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the individuals to whom the e-mail addresses belong affirmatively consent to their release. The city must release the remaining information; however, any information that is subject to copyright may be released only 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,



Claire V. Morris Sloan
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CVMS/som

Ref: ID# 576884

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Andrew P. Vickers
Taube Summers Harrinson Taylor Meinzer Brown, L.L.P.
100 Congress Avenue, 18th Floor
Austin, Texas 78701
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Mary F. Keller
Counsel for the Austin FBO, LLC
Winstead
401 Congress Avenue, Suite 2100
Austin, Texas 78701
(w/o enclosures)