



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 9, 2020

Ms. Megan R. Santee  
Attorney for the City of Leon Valley  
Denton Navarro Rocha Bernal & Zech, PC  
2500 West William Cannon Drive, Suite 609  
Austin, Texas 78745-5320

OR2020-28143

Dear Ms. Santee:

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# 852943 (Ref. No. 081220-A).

The City of Leon Valley (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for 1) electronic recordings created by a named individual during a specified time period, and 2) e-mails and text messages sent and received by six named individuals during a specified time period. You state you will release some information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, 552.108, 552.111, 552.117, and 552.131 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

We note some of submitted the information was the subject of a previous request for a ruling, as a result of which this office issued Open Records Letter No. 2020-17399 (2020). In that ruling, we determined, in relevant part, the city may withhold the marked information under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 and release the remaining information. We have no indication the law, facts, or circumstances on which the prior ruling was based have changed. Thus, the city must continue to rely on Open Records Letter No. 2020-17399 as a previous determination and withhold or release the information at issue in accordance with that ruling.<sup>1</sup> See Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (so long as law, facts, and circumstances on which prior ruling was based have not changed, first type of previous determination exists where requested information is precisely same information as was addressed in a prior attorney general ruling, ruling is addressed to same governmental body, and ruling concludes that information is or is not excepted from disclosure). However, we

---

<sup>1</sup> As we are able to make this determination, we need not address your arguments against disclosure of this information.

will consider your arguments for the submitted information not subject to the previous ruling.

Section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the internal records and notations of law enforcement agencies and prosecutors when their release would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. Gov't Code § 552.108(b)(1); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 531 at 2 (1989) (quoting *Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977)). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(b)(1) must explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.108(b)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706. Section 552.108(b)(1) is intended to protect “information which, if released, would permit private citizens to anticipate weaknesses in a police department, avoid detection, jeopardize officer safety, and generally undermine police efforts to effectuate the laws of this State.” *See City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320 at 327 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.). This office has concluded section 552.108(b)(1) excepts from public disclosure information relating to the security or operation of a law enforcement agency. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 (release of detailed use of force guidelines would unduly interfere with law enforcement), 252 (1980) (section 552.108 of the Government Code is designed to protect investigative techniques and procedures used in law enforcement), 143 (1976) (disclosure of specific operations or specialized equipment directly related to investigation or detection of crime may be excepted). Section 552.108(b)(1) is not applicable, however, to generally known policies and procedures. *See, e.g.*, ORDs 531 at 2–3 (Penal Code provisions, common law rules, and constitutional limitations on use of force not protected), 252 at 3 (governmental body failed to indicate why investigative procedures and techniques requested were any different from those commonly known).

You state the information you have marked, if released, would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution of crime. You state the release of the information at issue would reveal investigative techniques and adversely affect the city police department's efforts to detect and prevent crimes. Based on your representations and our review, we agree the release of the information at issue would interfere with law enforcement. Accordingly, the city may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup>

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 that is made confidential by other statutes, such as sections 418.176 through 418.182 of the Government Code, which were added to chapter 418 of the Government Code as part of the Texas Homeland Security Act (the “HSA”). Section 418.177 provides that information is confidential if it:

- (1) is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental entity for the purpose of preventing, detecting, or investigating an act of terrorism or related criminal activity; and

---

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

(2) relates to an assessment by or for a governmental entity, or an assessment that is maintained by a governmental entity, of the risk or vulnerability of persons or property, including critical infrastructure, to an act of terrorism or related criminal activity.

*Id.* § 418.177. 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 pertinent 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 generally relate to a governmental body's security concerns does not make the information *per se* confidential under the provisions of the HSA. *See* Open Records Decision No. 649 at 3 (1996) (language of confidentiality provisions 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 confidentiality statute, a governmental body asserting this section must adequately explain how the responsive information falls within the scope of the provision. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must explain how claimed exception to disclosure applies).

You state the information you have marked was provided to the city by the Bexar County Office of Emergency Management and the Regional Medical Operations Center San Antonio in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. You also state the information pertains to the city's critical infrastructure in responding to the pandemic. Upon review, we find the information at issue pertains to critical infrastructure for purposes of section 418.181 of the Government Code. *See generally id.* § 421.001(2) (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 state release of this information would expose vulnerabilities of the city's ability to address the pandemic. Based on your representations and our review, we find the city has demonstrated release of some of the information at issue would identify the technical details of particular vulnerabilities of the city to an act of terrorism. Thus, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.181 of the Government Code. However, we find you have failed to establish any portion of the remaining 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). Thus, we find you have not demonstrated the applicability of section 418.181 to the remaining information at issue, and the city may not withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code on this basis.

You also claim some of the remaining information is confidential under sections 418.177 and 418.182 of the Governmental Code. Upon review, however, we find you have failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information at issue was collected, assembled, or maintained by or for the city for the purpose of preventing, detecting, or investigating an act of terrorism or related criminal activity; relates to an assessment of the risk or vulnerability of persons or property to an act of terrorism or related criminal activity; or 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. Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with sections 418.177 or 418.182 of the Government Code.

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. This office has found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992) (employee's designation of retirement beneficiary, choice of insurance carrier, election of optional coverages, direct deposit authorization, forms allowing employee to allocate pretax compensation to group insurance, health care or dependent care), 523 (1989) (common-law privacy protects credit reports, financial statements, and other personal financial information), 373 (1983) (sources of income not related to financial transaction between individual and governmental body protected under common-law privacy). Upon review, we conclude the information we have marked meets the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find no portion of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public concern, and the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of common-law privacy.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides as follows:

- (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). A governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, orig. proceeding); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). A governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a).

You state, and provide documentation showing, a lawsuit styled *Tribble v. City of Leon Valley*, Cause No. 2018-CV-00594, was pending against the city in the 10th County Court of Bexar County, Texas, when the city received the instant request for information. You state the information at issue is related to the pending lawsuit. Based on your representations, the submitted documentation, and our review of the submitted information, we find litigation was pending when the city received this request for information, and the information at issue is related to the pending litigation for the purposes of section 552.103. Therefore, the city may withhold the remaining information you have marked under section 552.103(a) of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup>

Generally, however, 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. Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to the opposing parties in the pending litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a), and it must be disclosed. Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); 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

---

<sup>3</sup> As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

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 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 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.

You seek to withhold some of the remaining information under section 552.111 of the Government Code. You state the information at issue consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations of city employees regarding policymaking matters. You further state that portions of the information at issue consist of draft documents. We understand that these draft documents were intended to be released in their final forms. Upon review, we find the city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, we find the remaining information at issue consists of information that is administrative, related to personnel matters that do not rise to the level of policymaking, or purely factual in nature. Thus, you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue reveals advice, opinions, or recommendations that pertain

to policymaking. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information at issue under section 552.111 of the Government Code on the basis of the deliberative process privilege.

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). Section 552.117(a)(1) also applies to the personal cellular telephone number of a current or former official or employee of a governmental body, provided the cellular telephone service is not paid by a governmental body. *See Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-6 (1988)*. 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 under section 552.024 the information be kept confidential. Therefore, to the extent the employees at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the city may only withhold the marked cellular telephone numbers if the cellular telephone services are not paid for by a governmental body. Conversely, to the extent the employees at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024, the city may not withhold the marked information under section 552.117(a)(1). However, we find you have failed to establish section 552.117(a)(1) is applicable to any of the remaining information, and the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.117(a)(1).

Section 552.131(b) protects information about a financial or other incentive that is being offered to a business prospect by a governmental body or another person. *See Gov't Code* § 552.131(b). Section 552.131(b) protects the interests of governmental bodies, not third parties. The city claims 552.131(b) is applicable to the information at issue. However, we find the city has failed to demonstrate any portion of the information at issue reveals financial or other incentives the city is offering to a business prospect. Thus, we conclude the city may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.131(b) of the Government Code.

Section 552.136(b) of the Government Code provides, "[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential."<sup>4</sup> *Id.* § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining "access device"). Upon review, we find the

---

<sup>4</sup> The 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)*.

city must withhold the account numbers we have marked under section 552.136 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 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 subsection (c) applies.

We note some of the remaining information appears to be protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; *see* Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit.

In summary, the city must continue to rely on Open Records Letter No. 2020-17399 as a previous determination and withhold or release the information at issue in accordance with that ruling. The city may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.181 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city may withhold the remaining information you have marked under section 552.103(a) of the Government Code. The city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. To the extent the employees at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the city may only withhold the marked cellular telephone numbers if the cellular telephone services are not paid for by a governmental body. The city must withhold the account numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. 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 subsection (c) applies. The city must release the remaining information; however, any information subject to copyright may only be released in accordance with copyright law.

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,

Meredith L. Coffman  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

MLC/rm

Ref: ID# 852943

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)