



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 29, 2016

Mr. Joseph Harney
Assistant City Attorney
Office of the City Attorney
City of San Antonio
P.O. Box 839966
San Antonio, Texas 78283-3966

OR2016-28655

Dear Mr. Harney:

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# 639877 (COSA File No. W140902-100316).

The City of San Antonio (the "city") received a request for all documents pertaining to a specified entity from a specified date range. The city states it has made some information available to the requestor. The city claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.106, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. The city also states release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of Google Fiber. Accordingly, the city states it notified this third party 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 Act in certain circumstances). We have considered the exceptions the city claims and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note we have marked some of the submitted information as non-responsive because it was created after the date of the city's receipt of the request. This ruling does not address the public availability of non-responsive information, and the city is not required to release such information in response to this request.

We note an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received arguments from Google Fiber. Thus, Google Fiber has not

demonstrated it has a protected proprietary interest in any of the submitted information. *See id.* § 552.110(a)-(b); 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, that 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 city may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest Google Fiber may have in the information.

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).

The city states the responsive information consists of confidential communications involving city attorneys and city employees in their capacities as clients. The city states these communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the city. The city states the confidentiality of these communications has been maintained.

Based on these representations and our review, we find the city has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to some of the information at issue. Thus, the city may generally withhold the information we have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.¹

We note, however, some of these e-mail strings include e-mails received from and sent to parties with whom the city has not demonstrated it shares a privileged relationship. Furthermore, if the e-mails received from and sent to non-privileged parties are removed from the e-mail strings and stand alone, they are responsive to the request for information. Therefore, if the non-privileged e-mails, which we have marked, are maintained by the city separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then the city may not withhold these non-privileged e-mails under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. Further, we note the city has failed to demonstrate the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the remaining responsive information. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining responsive information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

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 (1993), 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 that 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 (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). Additionally, section 552.111 does not generally except from disclosure purely factual information that is severable from the opinion portions of internal memoranda.

¹As our ruling is dispositive for some of this information, we need not address the city’s remaining arguments against disclosure of it.

Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex. Attorney Gen., 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.); ORD 615 at 4-5. 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 also may be withheld under section 552.111. *See* Open Records Decision No. 313 at 3 (1982).

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

We note section 552.111 can encompass communications between a governmental body and a third party. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 631 at 2 (Gov't Code § 552.111 encompasses information created for governmental body by outside consultant acting at governmental body's request and performing task that is within governmental body's authority), 561 at 9 (1990) (Gov't Code § 552.111 encompasses communications with party with which governmental body has privity of interest or common deliberative process), 462 at 14 (1987) (Gov't Code § 552.111 applies to memoranda prepared by governmental body's consultants). When determining if an interagency communication is excepted from disclosure under section 552.111, we must consider whether the entities between which the communication is passed share a privity of interest or common deliberative process with regard to the policy matter at issue. *See id.* In order 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 at 9.

The city raises section 552.111 of the Government Code for the remaining responsive information. The city asserts the information at issue consists of advice, recommendations, and opinions pertaining to policymaking processes of the city. However, upon review, we find the information at issue is factual in nature, consists of internal administrative matters that do not rise to the level of policymaking, or was communicated with parties the city has not identified as sharing a privity of interest or a common deliberative process with the city. Therefore, we find the city has failed to demonstrate the information at issue constitutes internal communications containing advice, recommendations, or opinions reflecting the policymaking processes of the city. Thus, the city may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Section 552.106 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[a] draft or working paper involved in the preparation of proposed legislation” and “[a]n internal bill analysis or

working paper prepared by the governor's office for the purpose of evaluating proposed legislation." Gov't Code § 552.106(a)-(b). We note section 552.106(b) applies to information created or used by employees of the governor's office for the purpose of evaluating proposed legislation. The purpose of section 552.106 is to encourage frank discussion on policy matters between the subordinates or advisors of a legislative body and the members of the legislative body. *See* ORD 615 at 2. Therefore, section 552.106 is applicable only to the policy judgments, recommendations, and proposals of persons who are involved in the preparation of proposed legislation and who have an official responsibility to provide such information to members of the legislative body. *See id.* at 1; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 429 at 5 (1985) (statutory predecessor to section 552.106 not applicable to information relating to governmental entity's efforts to persuade other governmental entities to enact particular ordinances).

The city asserts the remaining responsive information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.106. However, upon review, we find the city has not demonstrated the information at issue constitutes drafts or working papers involved in the preparation of proposed legislation. Further, the city has failed to demonstrate this information constitutes an internal bill analysis or working paper prepared for the purpose of evaluating proposed legislation. Therefore, we conclude the city may not withhold any portion of the information at issue under section 552.106 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses information protected by other statutes. As part of the Texas Homeland Security Act, sections 418.176 through 418.182 were added to chapter 418 of the Government Code. These provisions make confidential certain information related to terrorism.

Section 418.181 provides,

Those 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. Section 418.182 provides, in relevant part,

(a) Except as provided by Subsections (b) and (c), information, including access codes and passwords, in the possession of a governmental entity that relates to the specifications, operating procedures, or location of a security system used to protect public or private property from an act of terrorism or related criminal activity is confidential.

Id. § 418.182(a). The fact that information may relate to a governmental body's security concerns does not make the information *per se* confidential under the Texas Homeland Security Act. *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 a claimed provision. As with any exception to disclosure, a governmental body asserting one of the confidentiality provisions of the Texas Homeland Security Act 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).

The city asserts sections 418.181 and 418.182 for portions of the remaining responsive information, stating the information shows "the location of a portion of the [c]ity's fiber optic cable network, including the location of Google Fiber facilities." The city explains a person with criminal or terroristic intent can gain access to the city's fiber optic network by breaking into control boxes that are operated via the city's fiber optic network, disconnect the fiber optic link, insert a device, and reconnect the link. The city argues release of the information at issue would put in jeopardy the security of the city's fiber optic network and all entities that connect to it. Based on these representations and our review, we agree portions of the information at issue fall within the scope of section 418.181. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked and indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.181 of the Government Code.² However, the city has failed to establish any portion of the remaining responsive information at issue reveals the technical details of particular vulnerabilities of critical infrastructure to an act of terrorism. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 542 (1990) (stating that governmental body has burden of establishing that exception applies to requested information), 532 (1989), 515 (1988), 252 (1980). Additionally, we find the city has failed to demonstrate any of the remaining responsive information at issue relates to the specifications, operating procedures, or location of a security system used to protect public or private property from an act of terrorism or related criminal activity. Thus, we find the city has not demonstrated the applicability of section 418.181 or section 418.182 to the remaining responsive information at issue, and the city may not withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code on either of these basis.

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. We note common-law privacy protects the interests of individuals, not those of corporate and other business entities. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 620 (1993) (corporation has no right to privacy), 192 (1978) (right to privacy is designed

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the city's remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

primarily to protect human feelings and sensibilities, rather than property, business, or other pecuniary interests); *see also Rosen v. Matthews Constr. Co.*, 777 S.W.2d 434 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1989) (corporation has no right to privacy (citing *United States v. Morton Salt Co.*, 338 U.S. 632, 652 (1950))), *rev'd on other grounds*, 796 S.W.2d 692 (Tex. 1990). Upon review, we find none of the remaining responsive information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining responsive information at issue under section 522.101 on the basis of common-law privacy.

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, emergency contact information, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code.³ Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). Section 552.117 is also applicable to 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)* (statutory predecessor to section 552.117 not applicable to cellular telephone numbers provided and paid for by governmental body and intended for official use). Whether a particular piece of information is protected by section 552.117 must be determined at the time the request for the information is made. *See Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989)*. Therefore, a governmental body must withhold information under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former official or employee only if the individual made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for information was made. Accordingly, the city must withhold the cellular telephone numbers we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code if the individuals whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality pursuant to section 552.024 of the Government Code and the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. The city may not withhold this information if the individuals whose information is at issue did not make a timely election to keep the information confidential or the cellular telephone service is paid for by a governmental body.

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 Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c)*. Section 552.137 does not apply to an institutional e-mail address, the general e-mail address of a business, an e-mail address of a person who has a contractual relationship with a governmental body, an e-mail address of a vendor who seeks to contract with a governmental body, an e-mail address maintained by a governmental entity for one of its officials or employees, or an e-mail address provided to a governmental body on a letterhead. *See id.* § 552.137(c). Upon

³The 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)*.

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

In summary, the city may generally withhold the information we have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code; however, if the non-privileged e-mails, which we have marked, are maintained by the city separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then the city may not withhold these non-privileged e-mails under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked and indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.181 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the cellular telephone numbers we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code if the individuals whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality pursuant to section 552.024 of the Government Code and the cellular telephone service is 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 if subsection (c) applies. The remaining responsive information must be released.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, 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,



Tim Neal
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

TN/som

⁴We note the information being released contains the requestor's personal e-mail address, to which the requestor has a right of access under section 552.137(b) of the Government Code. See Gov't Code § 552.137(b).

Ref: ID# 639877

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Third Party
(w/o enclosures)