



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 1, 2015

Mr. C. Robert Heath
Counsel for the Lower Colorado River Authority
Bickerstaff Heath Delgado Acosta LLP
3711 South MoPac Expressway, Building One, Suite 300
Austin, Texas 78746

OR2015-13214

Dear Mr. Heath:

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# 569484.¹

The Lower Colorado River Authority (the "authority"), which you represent, received two requests from the same requestor for all e-mails involving two named individuals sent over specified time periods, as well as the years worked, title, and pay amount of one of the named individuals.² You state you have released some information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.103, 552.104, 552.107, 552.111, 552.117, and 552.133 of the Government Code.³ We have

¹We note we have combined these requests, which originally were assigned identification numbers 569484 and 569703, under ID# 569484.

²We note the authority sought and received clarification of one of the requests from the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (if governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification of unclear or over-broad request, ten-day period to request attorney general ruling is measured from date request is clarified).

³Although you also raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with Texas Rule of Evidence 503, this office has concluded section 552.101 does not encompass discovery privileges. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 1-2 (2002), 575 at 2 (1990). Further, although you raise Texas Rule of Evidence 503, we note the proper exception to raise when asserting the attorney-client privilege in this instance is section 552.107 of the Government Code. *See* ORD 676 at 1-2.

considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.⁴

Initially, we note the authority seeks to withdraw its request for an open records decision because it asserts the request for information was withdrawn by operation of law when the requestor failed to timely respond to a cost estimate for providing the requested records. Upon review of a copy of the cost estimate, we find it does not comply with the requirements of section 552.2615(a) of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.2615(a). Accordingly, we conclude the request for information was not withdrawn by operation of law. *See id.* § 552.2615(b).

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*, No. 12-1007, slip op. at 17 (Tex. June 19, 2015). The authority states it has statutory authority to engage in competition in the electric utility marketplace and to develop, generate, distribute, and sell electric energy. The authority states it has specific marketplace interests in the information at issue because it supplies electricity to about 800,000 people in more than 50 counties in Texas and the information at issue relates to its competition in the wholesale power electric utility marketplace. The authority further explains its customers have sources other than the authority from which to obtain some of their electricity requirements. The authority argues release of this information would provide competitors in the electric utility marketplace with a competitive advantage over the authority by enabling them to determine the price, terms, and conditions necessary to tailor an offer that is competitively better than the authority’s prices, terms, and conditions. The authority states the release of the information at issue would place the authority at an overall disadvantage in the electric utility marketplace. After review of the information at issue and consideration of the submitted arguments, we find the authority has established the release of the information at issue would give advantage to a competitor or bidder. Thus, we conclude the authority may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.104(a).⁵

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

⁴We 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.

⁵As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the authority’s remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

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 portions of the remaining information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. You state the information at issue consists of communications between attorneys, officials, and employees of the authority. You state the communications were made in confidence for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the authority and these communications have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to some of the information at issue. Thus, the authority may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.⁶

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides, in relevant part:

⁶As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

(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.

...

(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). The governmental body claiming section 552.103 has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents sufficient to establish the applicability of section 552.103 to the information it seeks to withhold. To meet this burden, the governmental body must demonstrate: (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date of its receipt of the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *See Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, orig. proceeding); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.). Both elements of the test must be met in order for information to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.103. *See Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990)*. We note contested cases conducted under the Administrative Procedure Act (the "APA"), chapter 2001 of the Government Code, are considered litigation for purposes of section 552.103. *See Open Records Decision No. 588 at 7 (1991)*.

You state, and provide documentation showing, prior to the authority's receipt of the instant request, the authority was a party to a contested case proceeding before the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality. Based on this representation and our review, we agree litigation was pending in this matter on the date the authority received the present request for information. We agree the information at issue pertains to the substance of the lawsuit's claims. Therefore, we conclude the authority may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.103 of the Government Code.⁷

We note that, 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. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982)*. Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to all parties to the pending litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a) and must be disclosed. Further, the applicability of

⁷As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded. *See* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

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, no writ); Open Records Decision No. 538 at 1-2 (1990).

In Open Records Decision No. 615, this office re-examined the statutory predecessor to section 552.111 in light of the decision in *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ). 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 a 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 (Tex. 2000) (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking). A governmental body’s policymaking functions do 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 (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, the factual information may also be withheld under section 552.111. *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* ORD 561.

You state some of the remaining information consists of advice, opinion, and recommendations related to policymaking matters of employees and officials of the authority. Upon review, we conclude the authority may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code.⁸ However, we find the remaining information is general administrative information, is purely factual information, does not pertain to policymaking, or was shared with an individual with whom the authority has not demonstrated it shares a privity of interest or common deliberative process. Therefore, we find you have failed to demonstrate how any portion of the remaining information at issue consists of advice, opinions, or recommendations on policymaking matters. Accordingly, the authority may not withhold any portion of the remaining information at issue under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. This section encompasses information protected by other statutes. As part of the Texas Homeland Security Act (“HSA”), sections 418.176 through 418.182 were added to chapter 418 of the Government Code. These provisions make certain information related to terrorism confidential. You assert the requested data is confidential under section 418.181 of the Government Code, which provides “[t]hose documents or portions of documents in the possession of a governmental entity are confidential if they identify the technical details of particular vulnerabilities of critical infrastructure to an act of terrorism.” *Id.* § 418.181. The fact that information may relate to a governmental body’s security concerns does not make the information *per se* confidential under the HSA. *See* Open Records Decision No. 649 at 3 (1996) (language of confidentiality provision controls scope of its protection). Furthermore, the mere recitation by a governmental body of a statute’s key terms is not sufficient to demonstrate the applicability of the claimed provision. As with any exception to disclosure, a governmental body asserting one of the confidentiality provisions of the HSA must adequately explain how the responsive records fall within the scope of the claimed provision. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must explain how claimed exception to disclosure applies).

You assert, and we agree, dams are critical infrastructure. *See generally id.* § 421.001 (defining “critical infrastructure” to include “all public or private assets, systems, and functions vital to the security, governance, public health and safety, economy, or morale of the state or the nation”). You explain some of the remaining information pertains to dams. You assert the release of the information at issue would reveal weaknesses of two dams, thereby making them vulnerable to terrorist attacks. However, we conclude the authority has failed to establish any of the remaining information at issue identifies the technical details of particular vulnerabilities of critical infrastructure to an act of terrorism. Thus, the authority may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.181 of the Government Code.

⁸As our ruling is dispositive for this information, we need not address your remaining argument against its disclosure.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also 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. Upon review, we find none of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing information and of no legitimate public interest, and it may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.102(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.” Gov’t Code § 552.102(a). We understand you to 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. As previously mentioned, common-law privacy protects information if it (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. *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 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 has expressly disagreed with *Hubert’s* interpretation of section 552.102(a) and held the privacy standard under section 552.102(a) 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 also considered the applicability of section 552.102(a) and held it excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *See id.* at 348. Upon review, we find none of the remaining information is subject to section 552.102(a) of the Government Code, and the authority may not withhold any of the information at issue on that basis.

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. 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 confidentiality under section 552.024. Therefore, to the extent the individuals whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the authority must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the authority may only withhold the cellular telephone number we have marked if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service. Conversely, to the extent the individuals at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024, the authority may not withhold the marked information under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code provides, "an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body is confidential and not subject to disclosure under [the Act]," unless the owner of the e-mail address has affirmatively consented to its release or the e-mail address is specifically excluded by subsection (c).⁹ Gov't Code § 552.137(a)–(c). The authority must withhold the e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner of the e-mail address has affirmatively consented to its release.

In summary, the authority may withhold the information we have marked under sections 552.104, 552.107, 552.103, and 552.111 of the Government Code. To the extent the individuals whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the authority must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the authority may only withhold the cellular telephone number we have marked if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service. The authority must withhold the e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner of the e-mail address has affirmatively consented to its release. 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

⁹The 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).

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, appearing to read 'JBH', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Joseph Behnke
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JB/som

Ref: ID# 569484

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)