



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 8, 2022

Mr. David T. Ritter
Counsel for the City of McKinney
Brown & Hofmeister
740 East Campbell Road, Suite 800
Richardson, Texas 75081

OR2022-03343

Dear Mr. Ritter:

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# 929036 (Ref. No. G20767).

The City of McKinney (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for three categories of information regarding a named individual, a specified entity, and a certain address.¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, 552.1331, 552.136, and 552.139 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

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

¹ You state the city sent the requestor a cost estimate of charges pursuant to section 552.2615 of the Government Code, and the requestor accepted the cost estimate. *See* Gov't Code § 552.2615. The estimate of charges required the requestor to provide a deposit for payment of anticipated costs under section 552.263 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.263(a). You also inform us the city received the required deposit on November 3, 2021. *See id.* § 552.263(e) (if governmental body requires deposit or bond for anticipated costs pursuant to section 552.263, request for information is considered to have been received on date governmental body receives bond or deposit).

² 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.

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.* 503(b)(1), 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 submitted information consists of communications between attorneys for the city and city employees that were made for the purpose of providing legal services to the city. You indicate the communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find the information you indicated consists of privileged attorney-client communications the city may generally withhold under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. We note, however, some of these otherwise privileged e-mail strings include e-mails received from or sent to non-privileged parties. Furthermore, if the e-mails received from or sent to non-privileged parties are removed from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear and stand alone, they are responsive to the request for information. Therefore, if these non-privileged e-mails, which we have marked, are maintained by the city separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then the city may not withhold these non-privileged e-mails under section 552.107(1).

Section 552.1331 of the Government Code provides, in part:

(a) In this section:

(1) “Advanced metering system” means a utility metering system that collects data at regular intervals through the use of an automated wireless or radio network.

(2) “Government-operated utility” has the meaning assigned by Section 182.051, Utilities Code.

(b) Except as provided by Subsection (c) of this section and Section 182.052, Utilities Code, information maintained by a government-operated utility is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if it is information that:

(1) is collected as part of an advanced metering system for usage, services, and billing, including amounts billed or collected for utility usage; or

(2) reveals whether:

(A) an account is delinquent or eligible for disconnection; or

(B) services have been discontinued by the government-operated utility.

Gov’t Code § 552.1331(a)–(b). We understand the city is a government-operated utility for purposes of section 552.1331. *See* Util. Code § 182.051(3) (providing a “government-operated utility” is a governmental body or entity that, for compensation, provides water, wastewater, sewer, gas, garbage, electricity, or drainage service). You state the information you marked was collected as part of an advanced metering system for usage, services, and billing. Based upon this representation, we conclude the city must withhold the information you marked under section 552.1331(b)(1) 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.” Gov’t Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). Upon review, we agree the city must withhold the bank account and routing numbers you marked and the additional information we marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

Section 552.139 of the Government Code provides, in relevant part:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information that relates to computer network security, to restricted information under Section 2059.055 [of the Government Code], or to the design, operation, or defense of a computer network.

(b) The following information is confidential:

- (1) a computer network vulnerability report;
- (2) any other assessment of the extent to which data processing operations, a computer, a computer program, network, system, or system interface, or software of a governmental body or of a contractor of a governmental body is vulnerable to unauthorized access or harm, including an assessment of the extent to which the governmental body's or contractor's electronically stored information containing sensitive or critical information is vulnerable to alteration, damage, erasure, or inappropriate use; [and]
- ...
- (4) information directly arising from a governmental body's routine efforts to prevent, detect, investigate, or mitigate a computer security incident, including information contained in or derived from an information security log.

Gov't Code § 552.139(a), (b)(1)-(2), (4). Section 2059.055 of the Government Code provides, in pertinent part:

(b) Network security information is confidential under this section if the information is:

- (1) related to passwords, personal identification numbers, access codes, encryption, or other components of the security system of a governmental entity;
- (2) collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental entity to prevent, detect, or investigate criminal activity; or
- (3) related to an assessment, made by or for a governmental entity or maintained by a governmental entity, of the vulnerability of a network to criminal activity.

Id. § 2059.055(b). The city asserts the information it marked is subject to section 552.139. However, you have not demonstrated the information at issue relates to the city's computer network security, or to the design, operation, or defense of the city computer network as contemplated in section 552.139(a). Further, you have not demonstrated the remaining information consists of a computer network vulnerability report or assessment as contemplated by section 552.139(b). Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.139 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city may generally withhold the information you indicated under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code; however, the city may not withhold the marked non-privileged e-mails if they are maintained separate and apart from the otherwise

privileged e-mail strings in which they appear. The city must withhold the information you marked under section 552.1331(b)(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the bank account and routing numbers you marked and the additional information we marked under section 552.136 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 <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,

Emily Kunst
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

EK/mo

Ref: ID# 929036

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)