



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 6, 2019

Ms. Alma Lozano
Assistant City Attorney
City of San Antonio
P.O. Box 839966
San Antonio, Texas 78283-3966

OR2019-03488

Dear Ms. Lozano:

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# 749281 (COSA File No. W239187-110918).

The City of San Antonio (the "city") received a request for e-mail of named individuals during a specified period of time. You state you will release some information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.102, 552.104, 552.107, 552.111, and 552.117 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

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 indicate the information you have marked

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

pertains to a competitive bidding situation for a city contract which the city has not yet awarded. After review of the information at issue and consideration of the arguments, we find you established the release of the information at issue would give advantage to a competitor or bidder. Thus, we conclude the city may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code.

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). 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.*, 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 some of the remaining information consists of communications involving attorneys for the city and city employees and officials in their capacities as clients. You state these communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the city. You state these communications were intended to be, and have remained, confidential. 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

city may withhold the information you have marked 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, 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 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).

Further, section 552.111 does not protect facts and written observations of facts and events that are 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 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 that is 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.

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.

The city seeks to withhold some of the remaining information it marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The city states the information at issue consists of advice, recommendations, and opinions regarding city policy decisions. The city also indicates the submitted drafts of policymaking documents have been made available to the public in their final forms. Based upon your representations and our review, we find portions of information at issue, which we marked, consist of advice, opinions, or recommendations on the policymaking matters of the city. Accordingly, the city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, we find the remaining information at issue is either general administrative information that does not relate to policymaking, information that is purely factual in nature, or communications with a third party with whom you have not demonstrated the city shares a privity of interest or common deliberative process. Therefore, 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 552.102(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). The Texas Supreme Court held section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). Accordingly, the city must withhold the dates of birth of city employees under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code.

Section 552.102(b) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “a transcript from an institution of higher education maintained in the personnel file of a professional public school employee[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.102(b). This exception further provides, however, “the degree obtained or the curriculum on a transcript in the personnel file of the employee” are not excepted from disclosure. *Id.* However, upon review, we find none of remaining information consists of higher education transcripts of a professional public school employee. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.102(b) of the Government Code.

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.² *See id.* § 552.117(a)(1). Section 552.117 is 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 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. However, section 552.117 generally does not apply to applicants for employment. *See* ORD 455 (statutory predecessor to section 552.117 does not except information pertaining to applicants who are not employees).

Upon review, we conclude that, if the individuals at issue are currently or were formerly employed by the city and timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the city must withhold the information we indicated under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the city may only withhold the cellular telephone numbers at issue if a governmental body did not pay for the cellular telephone service. Conversely, to the extent the individuals were never employed by the city or if the individuals at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024, the city may not withhold this information under section 552.117(a)(1).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision."³ Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). Under the common-law right of privacy, an individual has a right to be free from the publicizing of private affairs in which the public has no legitimate concern. *Id.* at 682. The Third Court of Appeals has concluded public citizens' dates of birth are protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *See Paxton v. City of Dallas*, No. 03-13-00546-CV, 2015 WL 3394061, at *3 (Tex. App.—Austin May 22, 2015, pet. denied) (mem. op.). Thus,

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).

the city must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth in the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

We note some of the remaining information consists of personal e-mail addresses subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code. 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 is not applicable to an institutional e-mail address, an Internet website address, an e-mail address that a governmental entity maintains for one of its officials or employees, or a personal e-mail address belonging to a city employee or official used to conduct official government business. *See Austin Bulldog v. Leffingwell*, 490 S.W.3d 240 (Tex. App.—Austin 2016, no pet.) (holding personal e-mail addresses of government officials used to conduct official government business are not e-mail addresses of "members of the public" for purposes of Gov't Code § 552.137(a)). To the extent the e-mail addresses at issue belong to members of the public, the city must withhold such e-mail addresses under section 552.137, unless the individuals to whom the e-mail addresses belong affirmatively consent to their release. However, to the extent the e-mail addresses at issue are excluded by subsection 552.137(c) or belong to a city employee or official, the e-mail addresses may not be withheld under section 552.137 of the Government Code.

Section 552.140 of the Government Code provides a military veteran's DD-214 form or other military discharge record that is first recorded with, or that otherwise first comes into the possession of, a governmental body on or after September 1, 2003, is confidential for a period of seventy-five years and may only be disclosed in accordance with section 552.140 or in accordance with a court order. *See* Gov't Code § 552.140(a)-(b). The city came into possession of the submitted military discharge record after September 1, 2003. Accordingly, we conclude the city must withhold the military discharge record we have marked under section 552.140 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city may withhold the information you have marked under sections 552.104 and 552.107 of the Government Code. The city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the dates of birth of city employees under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. If the individuals at issue are currently or were formerly employed by the city and timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the city must withhold the information we have indicated under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the city may only withhold the cellular telephone numbers at issue if a governmental body did not pay for the cellular telephone service. The city must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth in the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. To the extent the e-mail addresses at issue belong to members of the public, the city must withhold such e-mail addresses under section 552.137, unless the individuals to whom the e-mail addresses belong

affirmatively consent to their release. The city must withhold the military discharge record we have marked under section 552.140 of the Government Code. 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,



Paige Lay
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

PS/gw

Ref: ID# 749281

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)