



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

May 24, 2004

Ms. Marney Collins Sims
Bracewell & Patterson
711 Louisiana Street, Suite 2900
Houston, Texas 77002-2781

OR2004-4214

Dear Ms Sims:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 203781.

The Columbia-Brazoria Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received six requests for various information regarding a pending real estate acquisition by the district of approximately 47 acres of land adjacent to Highway 35 in Brazoria to be used for the construction of a new junior high school. You state that the district does not have some information responsive to portions of the requests. *See Economic Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision No. 452 at 3 (1986) (governmental body not required to disclose information that did not exist at time request was received). You also state that the district will make some of the requested information available to the requestors. You claim that portions of the remaining requested information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107, 552.110, and 552.111 of the Government Code. Additionally, you have notified the attorneys for Richard L. Wright, Trustee of the Richard L. Wright Charitable Remainder Trust, the third party whose privacy or property interests may be implicated by the requests (the "third party"), of these requests and of their right to submit comments to this office in accordance with section 552.305 of the Government Code. *See Gov't Code* § 552.305 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure in certain circumstances). We have received correspondence from the third party. We have considered

all of the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information, some of which consists of representative samples.¹ We have also considered comments submitted by two of the requestors. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (providing that interested party may submit comments as to why requested information should or should not be released).

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. Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate that the information constitutes or documents a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made "for the purpose of facilitating 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 Texas 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)(A), (B), (C), (D), (E). 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 to whom disclosure is made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client or those reasonably necessary for the transmission of 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. *Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, no writ). Moreover, because the client may elect to waive the privilege at any time, a governmental body must explain that 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).

¹We 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.

You state that a portion of the submitted information, which you have marked, consists of communications between district employees and attorneys for the district, and you represent that these communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the district. Upon review of your arguments and this information, we conclude that it is protected by the attorney-client privilege, and thus may be withheld under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.111 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "an interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency." In Open Records Decision No. 615 (1993), this office reexamined the predecessor to the section 552.111 exception in light of the decision in *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ), and held that section 552.111 excepts only those internal communications consisting of advice, recommendations, and opinions reflecting the policymaking processes of the governmental body. *City of Garland v. Dalias Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351, 364 (Tex. 2000); *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.).

An agency's policymaking functions do not encompass internal administrative or personnel matters; disclosure of information relating to such matters will not inhibit free discussion among agency personnel as to policy issues. ORD 615 at 5-6. Additionally, section 552.111 does not generally except from disclosure purely factual information that is severable from the opinion portions of internal memoranda. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 37 S.W.3d at 160; ORD 615 at 4-5. The preliminary draft of a policymaking document that has been released or is intended for release in final form is excepted from disclosure in its entirety under section 552.111, because such a draft necessarily represents the advice, recommendations, or opinions of the drafter as to the form and content of the final document. Open Records Decision No. 559 at 2 (1990).

You state that some of the submitted information constitutes "communications between the superintendent of the District and the Board of Trustees regarding the Property and other property under consideration by the District" and that such memoranda "contain information and advice from the superintendent regarding the policymaking/deliberative process of the Board of Trustees in selecting future school sites for the District." Having reviewed your arguments and the information in question, we have marked a small portion of information that consists of advice, recommendations, and opinions reflecting the policymaking processes of the district. The district may withhold the marked information under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The remaining information you seek to withhold under section 552.111 does not consist of advice, recommendations, or opinions, and thus may not be withheld under that exception. Because you claim no other exception for this information, it must be released.

Next, we address the information that you claim is excepted under section 552.110 of the Government Code. The third party also claims that this information is excepted from

disclosure under section 552.110(b). Section 552.110 protects the proprietary interests of private persons by excepting from disclosure two types of information: (1) trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision and (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. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110.

The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of trade secret from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts. *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex.); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 2 (1990). Section 757 provides that a trade secret is

any formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is used in one's business, and which gives him an opportunity to obtain an advantage over competitors who do not know or use it. It may be a formula for a chemical compound, a process of manufacturing, treating or preserving materials, a pattern for a machine or other device, or a list of customers. It differs from other secret information in a business . . . in that it is not simply information as to single or ephemeral events in the conduct of the business A trade secret is a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business [It may] relate to the sale of goods or to other operations in the business, such as a code for determining discounts, rebates or other concessions in a price list or catalogue, or a list of specialized customers, or a method of bookkeeping or other office management.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939). In determining whether particular information constitutes a trade secret, this office considers the Restatement's definition of trade secret, as well as the Restatement's list of six trade secret factors.² *Id.* This office has held that if a governmental body takes no position with regard to the application of the trade secret branch of section 552.110 to requested information, we must accept a private person's claim for exception as valid under that branch if that person establishes a *prima facie* case for the exception and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. Open

²The six factors that the Restatement gives as indicia of whether information constitutes a trade secret are:

- (1) the extent to which the information is known outside of [the company];
- (2) the extent to which it is known by employees and others involved in [the company's] business;
- (3) the extent of measures taken by [the company] to guard the secrecy of the information;
- (4) the value of the information to [the company] and [its] competitors;
- (5) the amount of effort or money expended by [the company] in developing the information;
- (6) the ease or difficulty with which the information could be properly acquired or duplicated by others.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

Records Decision No. 552 at 5-6 (1990). However, we cannot conclude that section 552.110(a) applies unless it has been shown that the information meets the definition of a trade secret and the necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish a trade secret claim. *See* Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

Section 552.110(b) of the Government Code exempts from disclosure “[c]ommercial 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[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.110(b). Section 552.110(b) requires a specific factual or evidentiary showing, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the information at issue. *See* Open Records Decision No. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (stating that business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm); *see also Nat’l Parks & Conservation Ass’n v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974).

Initially, we note that, by its terms, section 552.110 only protects the interests of the person from whom the information was obtained. This provision does not protect the interests of the governmental body that receives proprietary information nor does it allow a governmental body to assert section 552.110 for information it creates. Accordingly, we find that the district has failed to establish the applicability of section 552.110. Furthermore, we find that the third party has failed to demonstrate that the remaining submitted information constitutes commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause the third party substantial competitive harm. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.110(b). Accordingly, none of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.110.

Finally, we address the third party’s argument that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.113 of the Government Code. Section 552.113 provides in relevant part as follows:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is:

.....

(2) geological or geophysical information or data, including maps concerning wells, except information filed in connection with an application or proceeding before an agency[.]

Gov’t Code § 552.113(a)(2). In Open Records Decision No. 627 (1994), this office concluded that section 552.113(a)(2) protects from public disclosure only commercially valuable geological and geophysical information regarding the exploration or development of natural resources. Open Records Decision No. 627 at 3-4 (1994) (overruling rationale of Open Records Decision No. 504 (1988)). We find that the third party has not demonstrated

that any of the submitted information is commercially valuable geological or geophysical information regarding the exploration or development of natural resources. Accordingly, we conclude the district may not withhold any of the requested information pursuant to section 552.113.

In summary, we conclude (1) the district may withhold the information it has marked under section 552.107 of the Government Code, and (2) the district may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The remaining submitted information, including the Environmental Site Assessment, must be released.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Sarah I. Swanson
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

SIS/krl

Ref: ID# 203781

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Randy Jones & Ken Corley
507 Erwin Street
Brazoria, Texas 77422
(w/o enclosures)

Sarah Smith
P. O. Box 919
Brazoria, Texas 77422
(w/o enclosures)

Tracie Teague
3116 CR 415 B
Brazoria, Texas 77422
(w/o enclosures)

Deborah Kaspar
P. O. Box 1677
Brazoria, Texas 77422
(w/o enclosures)

Kevin Bowen
The Facts
P. O. Box 549
Clute, Texas 77531
(w/o enclosures)

Michael Wright
The Facts
P. O. Box 549
Clute, Texas 77531
(w/o enclosures)

John O. Brentin & Associates,
L.L.P.
Attorneys at Law
3700 Buffalo Speedway,
Suite 560
Houston, Texas 77098-4711
(w/o enclosures)

Charles A. Daughtry
Daughtry & Jordan
17044 El Camino Real
Houston, Texas 77058
(w/o enclosures)