



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

December 10, 2014

Mr. Guillermo Trevino  
Assistant City Attorney  
Office of the City Attorney  
City of Fort Worth  
1000 Throckmorton Street, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

OR2014-22354

Dear Mr. Trevino:

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# 546897 (ORR# W037252).

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received a request for twenty-five categories of information associated with the city's benefit program.<sup>1</sup> You state the city is withholding e-mail addresses of members of the public under section 552.137 of the Government Code pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).<sup>2</sup> You state the city has released most of the requested information. You assert some of the submitted information does not consist of public information subject to the Act. You also claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.104, 552.107, and 552.111 of the

---

<sup>1</sup>You state the city sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or overbroad request for information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

<sup>2</sup>Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain information, including an e-mail address of a member of the public under section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

Government Code.<sup>3</sup> Additionally, you state release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of Aetna, AonHewitt, Compass Professional Health Services (“Compass”), Pursuit of Excellence (“PoE”), and Segal Waters Consulting (“Segal”). Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified Aetna, AonHewitt, Compass, PoE, and Segal of the request for information and of the right of each 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 Aetna and Segal. We have reviewed the submitted arguments and the submitted information, a portion of which you indicate consists of a representative sample.<sup>4</sup>

Initially, you argue some of the submitted information is not subject to the Act. The Act applies to “public information,” which is defined in section 552.002(a) of the Government Code as

information that is written, produced, collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business:

- (1) by a governmental body; or
- (2) for a governmental body and the governmental body:
  - (A) owns the information;
  - (B) has a right of access to the information; or
  - (C) spends or contributes public money for the purpose of writing, producing, collecting, assembling, or maintaining the information; or

---

<sup>3</sup>Although you also raise Texas Rule of Evidence 503, we note the proper exception to raise when asserting the attorney-client privilege is section 552.107 of the Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 1-2 (2002).

<sup>4</sup>We assume 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 those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

(3) by an individual officer or employee of a governmental body in the officer's or employee's official capacity and the information pertains to official business of the governmental body.

Gov't Code § 552.002(a). Information is "in connection with the transaction of official business" if it is "created by, transmitted to, received by, or maintained by an officer or employee of the governmental body in the officer's or employee's official capacity, or a person or entity performing official business or a government function on behalf of a governmental body, and pertains to official business of the governmental body." *Id.* § 552.002(a-1). Thus, virtually all of the information in a governmental body's physical possession constitutes public information and is subject to the Act. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 549 at 4 (1990), 514 at 1-2 (1988).

You argue some of the information submitted as Exhibit C-6 does not consist of public information subject to the Act. In Open Records Decision No. 581 (1990), this office determined certain computer information, such as source codes, documentation information, and other computer programming, that has no significance other than its use as a tool for the maintenance, manipulation, or protection of public property is not the kind of information made public under section 552.021 of the Government Code. ORD 581 at 5. The information at issue consists of portions of a response to the city's request for proposals submitted by a third party. Upon review, therefore, we find the information at issue has significance other than its use as a tool for the maintenance, manipulation, or protection of public information. Accordingly, we find the information at issue was collected, assembled, or maintained in connection with the transaction of the city's official business. Therefore, we conclude the information at issue is subject to the Act and the city must release it unless the information falls within an exception to public disclosure under the Act. *See id.* §§ 552.006, .021, .301, .302.

Next, Segal argues its information at issue, submitted as Exhibit C-7, is not responsive to the request for information. We note a governmental body must make a good faith effort to relate a request to information held by the governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 561 at 8 (1990). We assume the city has done so. Upon review, therefore, we find the information at issue, which the city submitted as responsive, to be responsive to the request. Therefore, the city must release the information at issue unless the information falls within an exception to public disclosure under the Act. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.006, .021, .301, .302. As no exceptions to disclosure have been raised for Exhibit C-7, the city must release that information.

We now turn to the submitted arguments against disclosure of the information. Section 552.104 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder." Gov't Code § 552.104(a). The purpose of section 552.104 is to protect a governmental body's interests in competitive bidding situations where the governmental body wishes to withhold information in order to

obtain more favorable offers. *See* Open Records Decision No. 592 (1991). Section 552.104 protects information from disclosure if the governmental body demonstrates potential harm to its interests in a particular competitive situation. *See* Open Records Decision No. 463 (1987). Moreover, section 552.104 requires a showing of some actual or specific harm in a particular competitive situation; a general allegation that a competitor will gain an unfair advantage will not suffice. Open Records Decision No. 541 at 4 (1990). This office has long held that section 552.104 does not except information relating to competitive bidding situations once a contract has been executed. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 541 (1990), 514 (1988), 306 (1982), 184 (1978), 75 (1975).

You state the information submitted as Exhibit C-3 was submitted in connection with a request for proposals for providers to administer the city's self-funded health care plans. You further state the contract arising from that process has not yet been awarded or executed. You claim release of the information at issue would undermine the contract negotiation process because until a final written contract is signed, negotiations with the preferred health plan administrator may fail, causing the city to select an alternate provider or issue a new request for proposals. Based on your representations and our review, we conclude you have demonstrated the applicability of section 552.104 to the information at issue. Accordingly, the city may withhold Exhibit C-3 under section 552.104 of the Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 170 at 2 (1977) (release of bids while negotiation of proposed contract is in progress would necessarily result in an advantage to certain bidders at expense of others and could be detrimental to public interest in contract under negotiation).

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information that comes 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* ORD 676 at 6-7. First, a governmental body must demonstrate 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. *See* 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. *See 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, lawyer representatives, and a lawyer representing another party in a pending action and concerning a matter of common interest therein. *See* 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 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. *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 submitted as Exhibit C-2 was communicated between attorneys for the city and city employees and officials in their capacities as clients. You state the communication was made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the city. You state the communication was intended to be, and has remained, confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Accordingly, the city may withhold Exhibit C-2 under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.<sup>5</sup>

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[.]” Gov’t Code § 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

---

<sup>5</sup>As our ruling is dispositive for this information, we need not address the remaining argument against its disclosure.

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 that are 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* ORD 561. We note a governmental body does not share a privity of interest with a third party when the governmental body and the third party are involved in contract negotiations, as the parties' interest are adverse.

You state some of the information submitted as Exhibit C-1, which you have marked, consists of communications regarding the decisional process of the city's approach to its self-funded health plan benefits and compliance with federal law. Thus, you state the information at issue consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations of the committee pertaining to the policymaking functions of the city. Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we find the city has demonstrated portions of the information at issue, which we have marked, consist of advice, opinions, or recommendations on the policymaking matters of the city. Thus, the city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. Upon review, however, we find the remaining information at issue is general administrative and purely factual information or does not pertain to policymaking. Further, some of the remaining information was received from an individual with whom you have not demonstrated the city shares a privity of interest or common deliberative process. Thus, we find you have failed to show how the remaining information at issue consists of internal communications containing advice, opinions, or recommendations on the policymaking matters of the city. Accordingly, the remaining information you marked may not be withheld under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Next, an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received comments from AonHewitt, Compass, or PoE explaining why the remaining information at issue should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude AonHewitt, Compass, or PoE has a protected proprietary interest in the remaining information. *See id.* § 552.110; Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the remaining information on the basis of any proprietary interest AonHewitt, Compass, or PoE may have in the information.

Aetna argues portions of its information, which is submitted as Exhibit C-4, are excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. Section 552.110(b) protects “[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). This exception to disclosure 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. *Id.*; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 661 at 5 (1999) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm).

Upon review, we find Aetna has failed to demonstrate the release of any of its information would result in substantial harm to its competitive position. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661 (for information to be withheld under commercial or financial information prong of section 552.110, business must show by specific factual evidence that substantial competitive injury would result from release of particular information at issue), 509 at 5 (1988) (because costs, bid specifications, and circumstances would change for future contracts, assertion that release of bid proposal might give competitor unfair advantage on future contracts is too speculative). Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of Aetna's remaining information under section 552.110(b).

The city claims some of the materials at issue may be protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; *see* Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted

by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit.

In summary, the city may withhold Exhibit C-3 under section 552.104 of the Government Code. The city may withhold Exhibit C-2 under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The city may withhold the information we marked in Exhibit C-1 under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information; however, any information that is subject to copyright may be released only in accordance with copyright law.

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 [http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl\\_ruling\\_info.shtml](http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml), or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Claire V. Morris Sloan  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CVMS/som

Ref: ID# 546897

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Lenee Goyett  
Vice President, Local Practice Leader  
AonHewitt  
301 Commerce Street, Suite 2101  
Fort Worth, Texas 76102  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Stephen P. Fisher  
Executive Director and Lead Counsel  
Government Sector and Labor  
Aetna  
151 Farmington Avenue, RE6A  
Hartford, Connecticut 06156  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Erick Bricker  
Chief Medical Officer  
Compass Professional Health  
Services  
3102 Oak Lawn, Suite 816E  
Dallas, Texas 75240  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Marie Diaz  
Chief Visionary Officer  
Pursuit of Excellence  
10440 North Central Expressway,  
Suite 1250  
Dallas, Texas 75231  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Elliott Susseles  
National Practice Leader  
Ms. Ruth Ann Eledge  
Vice President  
Segal Waters Consulting  
5050 Quorum Drive, Suite 625  
Dallas, Texas 75254  
(w/o enclosures)