



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 30, 2022

Mr. Stephen M. Foster  
General Counsel  
Texas Facilities Commission  
P.O. Box 13047  
Austin, Texas 78711-3047

OR2022-09280

Dear Mr. Foster:

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# 936226 (TFC PIR No. 2022-049).

The Texas Facilities Commission (the "commission") received a request for communications between commission employees and three specified firms during a certain time period, contracts between the commission and the same firms, and a list of addresses mentioned in a specified meeting. You state you will withhold certain information pursuant to section 552.136 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> You also state the commission has released some of the requested information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.104, 552.105, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. You also state you notified the General Land Office 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.<sup>2</sup> *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (providing that interested party may submit written comments regarding why information should or should not be released). We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Section 552.136(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 552.136(b) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See* Gov't Code § 552.136(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.136(e). *See id.* § 552.136(d), (e).

<sup>2</sup> As of the date of this ruling, we have not received any comments from the General Land Office.

<sup>3</sup> 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.

We note some of the information at issue was the subject of a previous request for a ruling, as a result of which this office issued Open Records Letter No. 2022-06088 (2022). In that ruling, we determined the commission (1) may withhold the information we indicated under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code; (2) may withhold certain information under section 552.111 of the Government Code; (3) must withhold the information we marked under section 552.110(c) of the Government Code; (4) must withhold the information we marked under section 552.1101(a) of the Government Code; (5) must withhold all insurance policy numbers in the remaining information under section 552.136 of the Government Code; and (6) must release the remaining information in accordance with copyright law. We have no indication the law, facts, or circumstances on which the prior ruling was based have changed. Accordingly, to the extent the requested information is identical to the information previously requested and ruled upon, the commission must continue to rely on Open Records Letter No. 2022-06088 as a previous determination and withhold or release the information at issue in accordance with that ruling. *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 will consider your arguments for the submitted information not subject to the previous ruling.

Section 552.104(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information that a governmental body demonstrates, if released, would “harm its interests by providing an advantage to a competitor or bidder in a particular ongoing competitive situation or in a particular competitive situation where the governmental body establishes the situation at issue is set to reoccur or there is a specific and demonstrable intent to enter into the competitive situation again in the future.” 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 Co. v. Paxton*, 466 S.W.3d 831, 841 (Tex. 2015). After review of the information at issue and consideration of the arguments, we find the commission has established the release of the information at issue would harm its interests by providing an advantage to a competitor or bidder in a particular ongoing competitive situation. Thus, we conclude the commission may withhold Exhibits C and G, and the information we marked in Exhibit D, under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code.<sup>4</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 the Homeland Security Act (the “HSA”). Sections 418.176 through 418.182 were added to chapter 418 of the Government Code as part of the HSA. Section 418.177 provides:

---

<sup>4</sup> As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

Information is confidential if the information:

(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

(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 states:

Those documents or portions of documents in the possession of a governmental entity are confidential if they identify the technical details of critical infrastructure to an act of terrorism.

*Id.* § 418.181. The fact that information may relate to a governmental body's security concerns does not make the information *per se* confidential under the HSA. *See* Open Records Decision No. 649 at 3 (1996) (language of confidentiality provision 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 exception to disclosure, a governmental body asserting one of the confidentiality provisions of the HSA must adequately explain how the responsive records fall within the scope of the claimed provision. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must explain how claimed exception to disclosure applies).

You argue the information at issue pertains to "the current and potential construction path of the border wall as well as information regarding the composition and physical structure and its surroundings." You assert, and we agree, the border wall is critical infrastructure. *See generally id.* § 421.001 (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"). *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 542 (1990), 532 (1989), 515 (1988), 252 (1980). You argue the release of the information at issue "could be used to identify possible vulnerabilities in the structure and aid criminals or terrorists in the commission of crimes related to the structure." Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated some of the information at issue identifies the technical details of particular vulnerabilities of critical infrastructure to an act of terrorism. Accordingly, the commission must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.181 of the Government Code. However, we find the commission has failed to demonstrate the remaining information relates to an assessment of the risk or vulnerability of persons or property, including critical infrastructure, to an act of terrorism or related criminal activity

or identify the technical details of critical infrastructure to an act of terrorism. Therefore, the commission may not withhold any portion of the remaining information section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.177 or section 418.181 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. *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).

You state Exhibit F consists of communications between attorneys for the commission, commission employees, and a privileged third party that were made for the purpose of providing legal services to the commission. You state the communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find Exhibit F consists of privileged attorney-client communications. Therefore, the commission may withhold Exhibit F under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

In summary, to the extent the requested information is identical to the information previously requested and ruled upon, the commission must continue to rely on Open Records Letter No. 2022-06088 as a previous determination and withhold or release the information at issue in accordance with that ruling. The commission may withhold Exhibits C and G, and the information we marked in Exhibit D, under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code. The commission must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.181 of the Government Code. The commission may withhold Exhibit F under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The commission 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/jxd

Ref: ID# 936226

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Third Party  
(w/o enclosures)