



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 13, 2015

Mr. Sam Aguirre
Assistant City Attorney
City of San Marcos
630 East Hopkins
San Marcos, Texas 78666

OR2015-21435

Dear Mr. Aguirre:

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# 582834.

The City of San Marcos (the "city") received three requests for several categories of communications and documents pertaining to a proposed agreement between Amazon.com.kydc, L.L.C. ("Amazon") and the city and the Greater San Marcos Partnership. You claim a portion of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code.¹ You also state release of the remaining information may implicate the proprietary interests of Amazon. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation demonstrating, the city notified Amazon of the request for information and of the company's right to submit arguments to this office stating why its information should not be released. *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 statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in certain circumstances). You inform us Amazon has advised the city that Amazon does not object to release of any of the submitted information.

¹Although you also raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 552.107 of the Government Code, this office has concluded section 552.101 does not encompass other exceptions found in the Act. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 1-2 (2002).

We have reviewed the exception you claim and the submitted representative sample of information.²

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 “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 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 claim the information you have marked consists of communications between the city’s legal counsel and city employees. You state these communications were made for the purpose of providing legal advice to the city. We understand these communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find the city has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client

²We 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 that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

privilege to the information at issue. Thus, the city may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.³

We note the remaining information contains information subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code.⁴ Section 552.117(a)(1) 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 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)* (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. 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. To the extent the employees whose information we have marked timely elected confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the city must withhold the information we have 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 services are not paid for by a governmental body. To the extent the employees at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024, the city may not withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1).

Section 552.137 of the Government Code 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)*. Upon review, we find the city must withhold the e-mail addresses in the remaining information under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless their owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure or section 552.137(c) applies.

³As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

⁴The 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)*.

In summary, the city may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. To the extent the employees whose information we have marked timely elected confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the city must withhold the information we have 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 services are not paid for by a governmental body. The city must withhold the e-mail addresses in the remaining information under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless their owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure or section 552.137(c) applies. The city 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.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,



Abigail T. Adams
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

ATA/akg

Ref: ID# 582834

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 2 Requestors
(w/o enclosures)

Amazon.com.kyde LLC
c/o Scott J. Ziance
Vorys, Sater, Seymour and Pease LLP
52 East Gay Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215
(w/o enclosures)