



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 7, 2022

Ms. Laura Reyna
Assistant City Attorney
City of San Antonio
P.O. Box 839966
San Antonio, Texas 78283-3966

OR2022-19518

Dear Ms. Reyna:

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# 957222 (Ref. No. W439237-040622).

The City of San Antonio (the "city") received a request for communications between city employees and officials pertaining to DeLorean Motor Company, Inc. ("DeLorean"), during a certain time period and communications between the city and DeLorean pertaining to a specified topic during a certain time period. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107, 552.111, and 552.137 of the Government Code. You also state release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of DeLorean. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified DeLorean 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 DeLorean. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information, a portion of which constitutes a representative sample.¹

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.

Initially, we must address the city's procedural obligations under the Act. Section 552.301 of the Government Code describes the procedural obligations placed on a governmental body that receives a written request for information it wishes to withhold. Pursuant to section 552.301(b), the governmental body must ask for the attorney general's decision and state the exceptions that apply within ten business days after receiving the request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(a), (b). In this instance, you state, and submit documentation demonstrating, the city received the request for information on April 6, 2022. Further, you state the city sought and received clarification on April 11, 2022. *See id.* § 552.222(b) (stating if information requested is unclear to governmental body or if large amount of information has been requested, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify or narrow request, but may not inquire into purpose for which information will be used). You do not inform us the city was closed for any business days between April 11, 2022, and April 25, 2022. Accordingly, the city's ten-business-day deadline was April 25, 2022. However, you did not request a ruling from this office until April 26, 2022. *See id.* § 552.308 (describing rules for calculating submission dates of documents sent via first class United States mail). Consequently, we find the city failed to comply with the requirements of section 552.301 in requesting this decision from our office.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless there is a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ). The city claims sections 552.107, 552.111, and 552.137 of the Government Code for the submitted information. Because sections 552.107 and 552.137 can provide compelling reasons to overcome the presumption of openness, we will address your arguments under these sections for the submitted information. However, we find you have failed to establish a compelling reason to address your remaining exception.

DeLorean raises section 552.104 of the Government Code for some of its information. Section 552.104 excepts from disclosure information "if a governmental body demonstrates that release of the information 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) (emphasis added). In *Boeing Co. v. Paxton*, 466 S.W.3d 831 (Tex. 2015), the Texas Supreme Court held section 552.104 does not preclude third parties from raising section 552.104 as an exception to disclosure. *See Boeing*, 466 S.W.3d at 842. However, the Eighty-sixth Legislature has amended section 552.104 since the issuance of *Boeing*. *See* Act of May 25, 2019, 86th Leg., R.S., S.B. 943, § 3. Section 552.104 now expressly limits the protections of section 552.104 to governmental bodies. Gov't Code § 552.104(a). Therefore, we do not address DeLorean's arguments under section 552.104.

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

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 excepts from disclosure “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.* § 552.110(c). DeLorean argues some of its information consists of trade secrets subject to section 552.110(b) and commercial or financial information subject to section 552.110(c).² Upon review, we find DeLorean has demonstrated portions of the information at issue constitute commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause substantial competitive harm. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(c) of the Government Code. However, we find DeLorean has failed to provide specific factual evidence demonstrating the remaining information at issue is a trade secret or constitutes commercial or financial information, the release of which would result in substantial competitive harm. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.110(b) or 552.110(c) of the Government Code.

We note some of the remaining information may be subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code.³ Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the current and former home addresses and telephone numbers, emergency contact information, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former employees of a governmental body who request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. *Id.* § 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 piece of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time the request for it is made. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Therefore, a governmental body must withhold information under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee only if the individual made a request for

² Although DeLorean cites to former sections 552.110(a) and 552.110(b) of the Government Code in its brief, we understand DeLorean to raise current sections 552.110(b) and 552.110(c) of the Government Code based on the substance of its arguments.

³ 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 No. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for this information was made. Accordingly, if the employees whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code and the cellular telephone services are not paid for by a governmental body, the city must withhold the cellular telephone numbers we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. Conversely, if the employees at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024 or the cellular telephone services are paid for by a governmental body, the city may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.117(a)(1).

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's license, driver's license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130. Accordingly, the city must withhold the license plate in the remaining information under section 552.130 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.

In summary, the city may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(c) of the Government Code. If the employees whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code and the cellular telephone services are not paid for by a governmental body, the city must withhold the cellular telephone numbers we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the license plate in the remaining information under section 552.130 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.

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/be

Ref: ID# 957222

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

1 Third Party
(w/o enclosures)