



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 14, 2016

Ms. Tiffany N. Evans
Assistant City Attorney
City of Houston
P.O. Box 368
Houston, Texas 77001-0368

OR2016-13531

Dear Ms. Evans:

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# 614046 (GC No. 23198).

The City of Houston (the "city") received a request for four categories of e-mails involving named city employees and elected officials. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.104, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides as follows:

- (a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

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

...

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). A governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, orig. proceeding); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). A governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a).

You state, and provide documentation showing, the city received the request for information after a lawsuit styled *City of Houston v. Genuine Parts Company*, Civil Action No. 4:16-cv-00694, was filed by the city in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas - Houston Division. You state Exhibit 8 is related to the pending lawsuit. Based on your representations, the submitted documentation, and our review of the submitted information, we find litigation was pending when the city received this request for information, and the information at issue is related to the pending litigation for the purposes of section 552.103. Therefore, the city may withhold Exhibit 8 under section 552.103(a) of the Government Code.

Generally, however, once information has been obtained by all parties to the litigation through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to the opposing parties in the litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a), and it must be disclosed. Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

Section 552.104(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder.” Gov't Code § 552.104(a). 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.” *Boeing Co. v. Paxton*, 466 S.W.3d 831 (Tex. 2015). You state Exhibits 5 and 6 pertain to a competitive bidding situation. In addition, you state the information pertains to an ongoing bidding process for which final contracts have not yet been awarded and release of the

information would negatively impact the bidding process. After review of the information at issue and consideration of the arguments, we find the city has established the release of the information at issue would give advantage to a competitor or bidder. Thus, we conclude the city may withhold Exhibits 5 and 6 under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code.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. *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 “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 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. *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 state Exhibits 2, 4, and 7 consist of communications between a city attorney and city employees that were made for the purpose of providing legal services to the city. You indicate the communications were intended to be confidential and have remained

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find the information at issue consists of privileged attorney-client communications. Therefore, the city may withhold Exhibits 2, 4, and 7 under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.³

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 (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).

Section 552.111 can also encompass communications between a governmental body and a third party, including a consultant or other party with a privity of interest. *See* Open Records Decision No. 561 at 9 (1990) (section 552.111 encompasses communications with party with which governmental body has privity of interest or common deliberative process). For section 552.111 to apply, the governmental body must identify the third party and explain the nature of its relationship with the governmental body. Section 552.111 is not applicable to a communication between the governmental body and a third party unless the governmental body establishes it has a privity of interest or common deliberative process with the third party. *See id.* We note a governmental body does not have a privity of interest

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

or common deliberative process with a private party with which the governmental body is engaged in contract negotiations. *See id.* (section 552.111 not applicable to communication with entity with which governmental body has no privity of interest or common deliberative process).

You seek to withhold the remaining information under section 552.111 of the Government Code. You state the information at issue consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations of city employees and officials regarding policymaking matters. Upon review, we find the city may withhold the information we have marked in the remaining information under section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, we find the remaining information at issue consists of information that is administrative or purely factual in nature, does not pertain to policymaking, or was sent to or received from a third party whom the city has not demonstrated shares a privity of interest or common deliberative process with the city. Thus, you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information reveals advice, opinions, or recommendations that pertain to policymaking. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.111 of the Government Code on the basis of the deliberative process privilege.

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home address and telephone number, social security number, and family member information of a current or former official or employee of a governmental body who requests that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code.⁴ *See id.* § 552.117(a)(1). We note that section 552.117 encompasses a personal cellular telephone number, provided that a governmental body does not pay for the cellular phone service. *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 information. *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 information. Therefore, to the extent the individual whose cellular phone number we have indicated timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 and a governmental body does not pay for the individual's cellular phone service, the city must withhold the cellular phone number we have indicated under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. However, if the individual did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024 or a governmental body does pay for the individual's cellular phone service, then the city may not withhold this information under section 552.117(a)(1).

⁴The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception 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 Exhibit 8 under section 552.103(a) of the Government Code. The city may withhold Exhibits 5 and 6 under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code. The city may withhold Exhibits 2, 4, and 7 under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. To the extent the individual whose cellular phone number we have indicated timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 and a governmental body does not pay for the individual's cellular phone service, the city must withhold the cellular phone number we have indicated under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.

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,



Matthew Taylor
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MHT/dls

Ref: ID# 614046

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)