



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 11, 2020

Ms. Heather K. Trachtenberg
Counsel for the Harris County Improvement District No. 18
Allen Boone Humphries Robinson, L.L.P.
3200 Southwest Freeway, Suite 2600
Houston, Texas 77027

OR2020-31103

Dear Ms. Trachtenberg:

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# 856672.

The Harris County Improvement District No. 23 (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for a particular proposal, as well as e-mail communications between the district and principals or directors of a named company during a specified time period. You state the district has released some information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107, 552.111, and 552.131 of the Government Code. You also state you notified the City of Houston Tax Increment Reinvestment Zone No. 18 and the Fifth Ward Redevelopment Authority (collectively, the "authority") of the request for information and of the right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released). We have received comments from the authority. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

Initially, we note the authority objects to disclosure of information the district has not submitted to this office for review. This ruling does not address information that was not submitted by the district and is limited to the information the district has submitted for our review. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body requesting decision from Attorney General must submit copy of specific information requested).

¹ We assume that 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 that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

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).

The district asserts the submitted information includes confidential communications between an attorney for the district and employees of the district that were made for the purpose of rendering professional legal advice. It also asserts the communications were intended to be confidential and their confidentiality has been maintained. We note the district has not identified the information it contends is privileged under the attorney-client privilege. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.301(e)(2) (governmental body must label information to indicate which exceptions apply). Therefore, you have failed to establish how the information at issue constitutes privileged attorney-client communications for the purposes of section 552.107(1). Accordingly, the district may not withhold the information at issue 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[.]” *Id.* § 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 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).

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 id.* We note a governmental body does not have a privity of interest or common deliberative process with a private party with which the governmental body is engaged in contract negotiations. *See id.* (section 552.111 not applicable to communication with entity with which governmental body has no privity of interest or common deliberative process).

You assert the submitted information, and the authority states portions of the submitted information, consist of advice, opinions, and recommendations pertaining to a specified project that were communicated between district representatives and representatives of third parties with whom the district shares a privity of interest regarding the district's policymaking pertaining to the project. Upon review, we find the district may withhold the

information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code.² However, the remaining information at issue is either factual in nature or consists of internal administrative matters that do not rise to the level of policymaking. Therefore, we find you and the authority have not demonstrated the remaining information at issue reveals advice, recommendations, or opinions that pertain to policymaking. Accordingly, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Section 552.131 of the Government Code relates to economic development information and provides, in part, the following:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if the information relates to economic development negotiations involving a governmental body and a business prospect that the governmental body seeks to have locate, stay, or expand in or near the territory of the governmental body and the information relates to:

(1) a trade secret of the business prospect; or

(2) 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.

(b) Unless and until an agreement is made with the business prospect, information about a financial or other incentive being offered to the business prospect by the governmental body or by another person is excepted from [required public disclosure].

Gov't Code § 552.131(a)-(b). Section 552.131(a) excepts from disclosure only “trade secret[s] of [a] business prospect” and “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.” *Id.* § 552.131(a). Section 552.131(a) protects the proprietary interest of third parties that have provided information to governmental bodies, not the interests of the government bodies themselves. Thus, we do not address the district’s arguments under section 552.131(a) for the information at issue

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 id.* § 552.131(b). Section 552.131(b) protects the interests of governmental bodies, not third parties. The district asserts the submitted information relates to confidential economic development negotiations that have not resulted in a final agreement with the business prospect. Upon review, we find the district has not demonstrated any of the remaining

² As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining argument against disclosure of his information.

information reveals financial or other incentives that are being offered to a business prospect. Thus, we conclude the district may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.131(b) of the Government Code.

In summary, the district may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The district 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,

Erin Groff
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

EMG/rm

Ref: ID# 856672

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Third Party
(w/o enclosures)