



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 23, 2020

Mr. W. Montgomery Meitler
Senior Counsel
Texas Education Agency
1701 North Congress Avenue
Austin, Texas 78701-1494

OR2020-11692

Dear Mr. Meitler:

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# 821233 (TEA PIR No. 41148).

The Texas Education Agency (the "TEA") received a request for information pertaining to specified contracts.¹ The TEA states it will release some of the requested information. The TEA claims some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code. Additionally, the TEA states release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of Imagination Station, Inc. ("IStation"). Accordingly, the TEA states, and provides documentation showing, it notified IStation 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 the Act in certain circumstances). We have received comments from

¹ The TEA 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).

IStation. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information, a portion of which is a representative sample.²

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. *See* Gov't Code § 552.107(1). 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). 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).

The TEA states some of the submitted information consists of communications involving attorneys for the TEA and TEA employees and officials in their capacities as clients. The TEA states these communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the TEA. The TEA states these communications were intended to be, and have remained, confidential. Based on the TEA’s representations and our review, we find the TEA has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Accordingly, the TEA may withhold the information it marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

² We 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.

Section 552.110(b) of the Government Code states, “[e]xcept as provided by [s]ection 552.0222, information is [excepted from required disclosure] if it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that the information is a trade secret.” *See* Gov’t Code § 552.110(b). Section 552.110(a) defines a trade secret as all forms and types of information if:

- (1) the owner of the trade secret has taken reasonable measures under the circumstances to keep the information secret; and
- (2) the information derives independent economic value, actual or potential, from not being generally known to, and not being readily ascertainable through proper means by, another person who can obtain economic value from the disclosure or use of the information.

Id. § 552.110(a). Section 552.110(c) of the Government Code states:

- (c) Except as provided by Section 552.0222, commercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that disclosure would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained is [excepted from required disclosure].

Id. § 552.110(c). Additionally, we note section 552.0222(b) lists certain types of information to which section 552.110 does not apply. *See id.* § 552.0222(b). IStation argues some of its information consists of commercial or financial information subject to section 552.110(c). Upon review, we find IStation has demonstrated portions of the information at issue constitute commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause substantial competitive harm. Accordingly, the TEA must withhold the information we have indicated under section 552.110(c) of the Government Code.³ However, we find some of the remaining information at issue is subject to section 552.0222(b) and may not be withheld on the basis of section 552.110(c). Additionally, we find IStation has failed to provide specific factual evidence demonstrating any portion of the rest of the remaining information at issue constitutes commercial or financial information, the release of which would result in substantial competitive harm. Therefore, the TEA may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.110(c) of the Government Code.

IStation also argues some of its information consists of trade secrets subject to section 552.110(b). Upon review, we find some of the remaining information at issue is subject to section 552.0222(b) and may not be withheld on the basis of section 552.110(b). Additionally, we find IStation has failed to provide specific factual evidence demonstrating any portion of the rest of the remaining information at issue is a trade secret. Therefore, the TEA may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

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

Section 552.1101 of the Government Code provides, in relevant part:

(a) Except as provided by Section 552.0222, information submitted to a governmental body by a vendor, contractor, potential vendor, or potential contractor in response to a request for a bid, proposal, or qualification is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if the vendor, contractor, potential vendor, or potential contractor that the information relates to demonstrates based on specific factual evidence that disclosure of the information would:

(1) reveal an individual approach to:

(A) work;

(B) organizational structure;

(C) staffing;

(D) internal operations;

(E) processes; or

(F) discounts, pricing methodology, pricing per kilowatt hour, cost data, or other pricing information that will be used in future solicitation or bid documents; and

(2) give advantage to a competitor.

(b) The exception to disclosure provided by Subsection (a) does not apply to:

(1) information in a voucher or contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of public funds by a governmental body; or

(2) communications and other information sent between a governmental body and a vendor or contractor related to the performance of a final contract with the governmental body or work performed on behalf of the governmental body.

Id. § 552.1101(a), (b). Additionally, we note section 552.0222(b) lists certain types of information to which section 552.1101(a) does not apply. *See id.* § 552.0222(b). IStation asserts disclosure of some of its information would reveal an individual approach to work, internal operations, processes, discounts, or other pricing information that will be used in future bid documents and give advantage to a competitor. Upon review, we find some of the remaining information at issue is subject to section 552.0222(b) and may not be withheld on the basis of section 552.1101(a). *See id.* §§ 552.0222(b) (listing certain types

of information not excepted under section 552.1101). Additionally, we find IStation has failed to provide specific factual evidence demonstrating any portion of the rest of the remaining information at issue is subject to section 552.1101(a). Therefore, the TEA may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.1101(a) of the Government Code.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code 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 id.* § 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 review, we find the information at issue consists of e-mail addresses that are specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). *See id.* Thus, the TEA may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.137 of the Government Code.

In summary, the TEA may withhold the information it marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The TEA must withhold the information we have indicated under section 552.110(c) of the Government Code. The TEA 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 <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,

Alexandra C. Burks
Attorney
Open Records Division

ACB/mo

Ref: ID# 821233

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Third Party
(w/o enclosures)