



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 1, 2016

Mr. David V. Bryce  
Office of General Counsel  
Houston Housing Authority  
2640 Fountain View Drive  
Houston, Texas 77057

OR2016-12485

Dear Mr. Bryce:

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# 612271.

The Houston Housing Authority (the "authority") received a request for all documents pertaining to the authority's relationship with a named individual and two specified companies. You state you do not have some information.<sup>1</sup> You claim a portion of the requested information is not subject to the Act. You also claim portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107, 552.111, and 552.139 of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> You also state release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of Geotech Engineering and Testing ("Geotech") and CenterPoint Energy ("CenterPoint"). You state you notified Geotech and CenterPoint of the authority's receipt of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as

---

<sup>1</sup>The Act does not require a governmental body to release information that did not exist when a request for information was received or to prepare new information in response to a request. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266, 267-68 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

<sup>2</sup>Although you also raise Texas Rule of Evidence 503, we note 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 of the Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 1-2 (2002), 575 at 2 (1990).

to why the requested information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 at 3 (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 exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>3</sup>

You contend some of the submitted information is not subject to the Act. The Act is applicable only to "public information." Gov't Code §§ 552.002, .021. Section 552.002(a) defines "public information" as

information that is written, produced, collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business:

(1) by a governmental body;

(2) for a governmental body and the governmental body:

(A) owns the information;

(B) has a right of access to the information; or

(C) spends or contributes public money for the purpose of writing, producing, collecting, assembling, or maintaining the information; or

(3) by an individual officer or employee of a governmental body in the officer's or employee's official capacity and the information pertains to official business of the governmental body.

*Id.* § 552.002(a). In Open Records Decision No. 581 (1990), this office determined that certain computer information such as source codes, documentation information and other computer programming, that has no significance other than its use as a tool for the maintenance, manipulation, or protection of public property, is not the kind of information made public under section 552.021 of the Government Code. *See* ORD 581 at 6 (construing predecessor to Act). We understand you to assert the submitted IP addresses have no significance other than their use as a tool for the maintenance, manipulation, or protection of public property. We disagree. The information at issue the reveals the identity of

---

<sup>3</sup>We 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.

individuals, including the individual named in the request, who provided an electronic signature on a contract between the authority and another entity. Thus, we find the submitted IP addresses do have public significance other than their use as tools for the maintenance, manipulation, or protection of public property. Accordingly, we find the information at issue is public information subject to the Act. Therefore, we will address the Act's applicability to the submitted IP addresses as well as the remaining information.

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 requested information relating to it should be withheld from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, Geotech and CenterPoint have not submitted to this office any reasons explaining why the requested information should not be released. Thus, we have no basis for concluding the submitted information constitutes proprietary information of the third parties. *See* 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, 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, the authority may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest Geotech or CenterPoint may have in it.

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. ORD 676 at 6-7. 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 Exhibits 1A and 1B consist of communications between the authority’s attorneys or attorney representatives and employees of the authority that were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the authority. You state the information at issue is confidential and has remained so. Therefore, based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Accordingly, the authority may withhold Exhibits 1A and 1B under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.<sup>4</sup>

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. This exception 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, writ ref’d n.r.e.); *Open Records Decision No. 538 at 1-2 (1990)*.

In *Open Records Decision No. 615*, we determined 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 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 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 severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152, 157

---

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

(Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.); *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, section 552.111 protects the factual information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 313 at 3 (1982).

This office has also concluded section 552.111 exempts from disclosure a preliminary draft of a document intended for public release in its final form because the draft necessarily represents the drafter's advice, opinion, and recommendation with regard to the form and content of the final document. *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 of a preliminary draft of a policymaking document, including comments, underlining, deletions, and proofreading marks, that will be released to the public in its final form. *See id.* at 2.

You state Exhibits 2 and 3 contain advice, opinions, and recommendations relating to the authority's policymaking. You also state the information at issue consists of draft documents. You do not state whether the draft documents will be released to the public in their final forms. Thus, to the extent the authority will release the submitted draft documents to the public in their final forms, the authority may withhold the submitted draft documents in their entirety under section 552.111 of the Government Code. To the extent the district will not release the draft documents to the public in their final forms, the authority may not withhold the submitted draft documents in their entirety under section 552.111. In this case, we find portions of the draft documents constitute advice, opinions, or recommendations relating to the authority's policymaking. Thus, to the extent the draft documents will not be released in their final forms, the authority may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 within the submitted draft documents. However, we find the remaining information consists of either general administrative information that does not relate to policymaking or information that is purely factual in nature. Therefore, the remaining information may not be withheld under section 552.111.

Section 552.139 of the Government Code provides, in part:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information that relates to computer network security, to restricted information under Section 2059.055 [of the Government Code], or to the design, operation, or defense of a computer network.

(b) The following information is confidential:

(1) a computer network vulnerability report; [and]

(2) any other assessment of the extent to which data processing operations, a computer, a computer program, network, system, or system interface, or software of a governmental body or of a contractor of a governmental body is vulnerable to unauthorized access or harm, including an assessment of the extent to which the governmental body's or contractor's electronically stored information containing sensitive or critical information is vulnerable to alteration, damage, erasure, or inappropriate use[.]

Gov't Code § 552.139(a), (b)(1)-(2). Section 2059.055 of the Government Code provides in pertinent part:

(b) Network security information is confidential under this section if the information is:

(1) related to passwords, personal identification numbers, access codes, encryption, or other components of the security system of a state agency;

(2) collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental entity to prevent, detect, or investigate criminal activity; or

(3) related to an assessment, made by or for a governmental entity or maintained by a governmental entity, of the vulnerability of a network to criminal activity.

*Id.* § 2059.055(b). You state Exhibit 4 contains IP addresses that “reflect the identity of computers being used by respective individuals for the purpose of providing an electronic signature[.]” However, upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate this information relates to computer network security, to restricted information under section 2059.055, or the design, operation, or defense of a computer network or consists of a computer network vulnerability report or assessment as contemplated by section 552.139. Accordingly, the authority may not withhold the information at issue on the basis of section 552.139 of the Government Code.

In summary, the authority may withhold Exhibits 1A and 1B under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. To the extent the authority will release the submitted draft documents to the public in their final forms, the authority may withhold the submitted draft documents in their entirety under section 552.111 of the Government Code. To the extent the draft documents will not be released in their final forms, the authority may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 within the submitted draft documents and must release the remaining information in Exhibits 2 and 3. The authority must release Exhibit 4.

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](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,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Cole Hutchison". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, stylized "C" and "H".

Cole Hutchison  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CH/akg

Ref: ID# 612271

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

2 Third Parties  
(w/o enclosures)