



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 3, 2020

Ms. Tammye Curtis-Jones  
Office of General Counsel  
Houston Housing Authority  
2640 Fountain View Drive  
Houston, Texas 77057

OR2020-03169

Dear Ms. Curtis-Jones:

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# 809919.

The Houston Housing Authority (the "authority") received a request for six categories of information pertaining to specified properties and agreements.<sup>1</sup> You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.104, 552.105, 552.107, 552.111, and 552.143 of the Government Code. You also state, and provide documentation showing, you notified NRP Group LLC ("NRP") and Ojala Partners, LLP ("Ojala") of the request for information and of their 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 the Act in certain circumstances). We have received comments from NRP and Ojala. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

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*

---

<sup>1</sup>The authority states it sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing 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) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or overbroad request for information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

*Co. v. Paxton*, 466 S.W.3d 831, 841 (Tex. 2015). You represent some of the information at issue pertains to an ongoing competitive bidding situation. In addition, you state release of the information at issue would disadvantage the authority in the current bidding process. After review of the information at issue and consideration of the arguments, we find the authority has established the release of the information at issue would give an advantage to a competitor or bidder. Thus, we conclude the authority may withhold the information you marked under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup>

Section 552.105 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information relating to “(1) the location of real or personal property for a public purpose prior to public announcement of the project; or (2) appraisals or purchase price of real or personal property for a public purpose prior to the formal award of contracts for the property.” Gov’t Code § 552.105(1), (2). Section 552.105 is designed to protect a governmental body’s planning and negotiating position with respect to particular transactions. Open Records Decision Nos. 564 at 2 (1990), 357 (1982), 310 (1982). Information that is excepted from disclosure under section 552.105 that pertains to such negotiations may be excepted from disclosure so long as the transaction relating to that information is not complete. *See* ORD 310. But the protection offered by section 552.105 is not limited solely to transactions not yet finalized. This office has concluded that information about specific parcels of land obtained in advance of other parcels to be acquired for the same project could be withheld where release of the information would harm the governmental body’s negotiating position with respect to the remaining parcels. *See* ORD 564 at 2. A governmental body may withhold information “which, if released, would impair or tend to impair [its] ‘planning and negotiating position in regard to particular transactions.’” ORD 357 at 3 (quoting Open Records Decision No. 222 (1979)). The question of whether specific information, if publicly released, would impair a governmental body’s planning and negotiating position with regard to particular transactions is a question of fact. Accordingly, this office will accept a governmental body’s good-faith determination in this regard, unless the contrary is clearly shown as a matter of law. *See* ORD 564.

You state the information you marked relates to the location of real properties the authority intends to acquire for a public purpose. You assert the release of this information would damage the authority’s planning and negotiating positions with respect to the acquisition of properties needed for the project. Based on your representations and our review, we conclude the authority may withhold the information you marked under section 552.105 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. 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.

---

<sup>2</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

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.*, 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 state the information you marked consists of communications involving attorneys for the authority and authority 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 authority. 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 some of the information at issue. Accordingly, the authority may withhold the information you 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 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. 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).

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 the information you marked consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations of authority employees and consultants for the university regarding policymaking matters. Upon review, we find you have established the deliberative process privilege is applicable to the information we marked. Therefore, the authority may withhold the information we marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, we find the remaining information at issue consists of either general administrative information that does not relate to policymaking or information that is purely factual in nature. Thus, we find the authority has not demonstrated the remaining information at issue is excepted under section 552.111. Accordingly, the authority may not withhold the remaining information at issue under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Section 552.143 of the Government Code provides, in part, the following:

(a) All information prepared or provided by a private investment fund and held by a governmental body that is not listed in Section 552.0225(b) is confidential and excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021.

(b) Unless the information has been publicly released, pre-investment and post-investment diligence information, including reviews and analyses, prepared for or maintained by a governmental body or a private investment fund is confidential and excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021, except to the extent it is subject to disclosure under Subsection (c).

Gov't Code § 552.143(a), (b). You contend the information you marked is protected under section 552.143. You state the information at issue consists of pre-investment analysis and due diligence information of certain real estate investments. You also state this information is not subject to section 552.0225 of the Government Code. Further, we find the information at issue is not subject to section 552.143(c). Accordingly, the authority must withhold the information you marked under section 552.143(b) of the Government Code

In summary, the authority may withhold the information you marked under sections 552.104(a), 552.105, and 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The authority may withhold the information we marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The authority must withhold the information you marked under section 552.143 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 <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open-government/members-public/what-expect-after-ruling-issued> or call the OAG's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Public Information Act may be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the OAG, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Paige Lay  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

PL/be

Ref: ID# 809919

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

2 Third Parties  
(w/o enclosures)