



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 3, 2016

Mr. James R. Palomo
Assistant City Attorney
Office of the City Attorney
City of San Antonio
P.O. Box 839966
San Antonio, Texas 78283-3966

OR2016-02645

Dear Mr. Palomo:

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# 596551 (COSA File No. W102101-110315).

The City of San Antonio (the "city") received a request for e-mails and other documents including specified terms during a specified time period. You claim portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.106, 552.111, 552.117, 552.131, and 552.137 of the Government Code.¹ You also state release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of La Villita Del Rio Development, Ltd. ("La Villita"). Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified La Villita 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 La Villita. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.131(b) of the Government Code provides:

¹Although the city does not raise sections 552.117 and 552.137 in its brief to this office, we understand the city to raise these exceptions based on its markings in the submitted documents.

...

(b) Unless and until an agreement is made with the business prospect, information about a financial or other incentive being offered to the business prospect by the governmental body or by another person is excepted from [required public disclosure].

Gov't Code § 552.131(b). Section 552.131(b) protects information about a financial or other incentive offered to a business prospect by a governmental body or another person. Upon review, we find the city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.131(b) of the Government Code. However, we find no portion of the remaining information pertains to a financial or other incentive offered to a business prospect by a governmental body or another person. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.131(b) of the Government Code.

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[.]” *Id.* § 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, 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, 364 (Tex. 2000) (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking). A governmental body's policymaking functions 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 severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152, 157 (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, section 552.111 protects the factual information. *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 which the governmental body establishes it has a privity of interest or common deliberative process. *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.

The city states portions of the remaining information consist of advice, opinions, and recommendations communicated between city staff and representatives relating to the city's policymaking. Upon review, we find the city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code.² However, we find the city has failed to demonstrate it shares a privity of interest or common deliberative process with some of the individuals in the remaining communications. Further, some of the remaining information at issue consists of either general administrative information that does not relate to policymaking or information that is purely factual in nature. Thus, we find the city has failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue is excepted under section 552.111. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Section 552.106 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "[a] draft or working paper involved in the preparation of proposed legislation." Gov't Code § 552.106(a). Section 552.106 of the Government Code resembles section 552.111 in that both exceptions protect advice, opinion, and recommendation on policy matters in order to encourage frank discussion during the policymaking process. *See* Open Records Decision No. 460 at 2 (1987). However, section 552.106 applies specifically to the legislative process and is narrower than section 552.111. *Id.* Therefore, section 552.106 is applicable only to the policy judgments, recommendations, and proposals of persons who are involved in the preparation of proposed legislation and who have an official responsibility to provide such information to members of the legislative body. *Id.* Section 552.106 does not protect purely factual information from public disclosure. *See id.*; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 344 at 3-4 (1982) (for purposes of statutory predecessor, factual information prepared by State Property Tax Board did not reflect policy judgments, recommendations, or proposals concerning drafting of legislation). Upon review of your arguments, we find you have not demonstrated the remaining information consists of policy judgments, recommendations, or proposals pertaining to the preparation of proposed legislation. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.106 of the Government Code.

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home address and telephone number, emergency contact information, social security number, and family member information of a current or former employee or official of a governmental body who requests this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). We note section 552.117 is also applicable to personal cellular telephone numbers, provided the cellular telephone service is not paid for

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

by a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-6 (1988) (section 552.117 not applicable to cellular telephone numbers paid for by governmental body and intended for official use). Whether a particular item of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Thus, information may be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) only on behalf of a current or former employee or official who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. Information may not be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee or official who did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024. The city indicates the remaining information includes cellular telephone numbers of city employees. Therefore, to the extent the individuals whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the city must withhold the cellular telephone numbers of city employees within the remaining responsive information under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the city may not withhold the cellular telephone numbers if a governmental body pays for the cellular telephone service. Conversely, to the extent the individuals at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024, the city may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.117(a)(1).

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* Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). We note section 552.137 does not apply to an e-mail address "contained in a response to a request for bids or proposals, contained in a response to similar invitations soliciting offers or information relating to a potential contract, or provided to a governmental body in the course of negotiating the terms of a contract or potential contract[.]" *See id.* § 552.137(c)(3). Some of the e-mail addresses you seek to withhold are subject to section 552.137(c)(3). Therefore, the city may not withhold those e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.137(a). However, upon review, the city must withhold the e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137, unless the owner affirmatively consents to release of his e-mail address.

La Villita asserts some of the remaining information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110 protects (1) trade secrets and (2) commercial or financial information the disclosure of which would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(a)-(b). Section 552.110(a) protects trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. *Id.* § 552.110(a). The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of trade secret from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts, which holds a trade secret to be:

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); *see also Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 776 (Tex. 1958). 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.³ RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b. This office must accept a claim information subject to the Act is excepted as a trade secret if a prima facie case for the exception is made and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. *See* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5 (1990). However, we cannot conclude section 552.110(a) is applicable unless it has been shown the information meets the definition of a trade secret and the necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish a trade secret claim. Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

Section 552.110(b) protects “[c]ommercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence 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, substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the information at issue. *Id.*; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 661 at 5-6 (1999).

³The Restatement of Torts lists the following six factors as indicia of whether information constitutes a trade secret:

- (1) the extent to which the information is known outside of [the company];
- (2) the extent to which it is known by employees and other 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; *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

La Villita asserts section 552.110(b) for portions of the remaining information. Upon review, we find La Villita has demonstrated its customer and reference information constitutes commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause substantial competitive injury. Accordingly, the city must generally withhold La Villita's customer and reference information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code; however, the city may not withhold La Villita's customer and reference information to the extent such information is publicly available on its website.⁴ Further, we find La Villita has not demonstrated release of any of the remaining information would result in substantial harm to its competitive position. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

La Villita argues portions of the remaining information, including any customer and reference information publicly available on its website, constitute trade secrets under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. Upon review, we find La Villita has failed to establish a *prima facie* case this information meets the definition of a trade secret and has not demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. *See* ORD 402 (section 552.110(a) does not apply unless information meets definition of trade secret and necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish trade secret claim), ORD 319 at 3 (information relating to organization and personnel, professional references, market studies, qualifications, and pricing are not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Accordingly, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

La Villita also raises section 552.131 of the Government Code for some of the remaining information. Section 552.131 relates to economic development information and provides in part:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if the information relates to economic development negotiations involving a governmental body and a business prospect that the governmental body seeks to have locate, stay, or expand in or near the territory of the governmental body and the information relates to:

(1) a trade secret of the business prospect; or

(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.

⁴As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address La Villita's remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

(b) Unless and until an agreement is made with the business prospect, information about a financial or other incentive being offered to the business prospect by the governmental body or by another person is excepted from [required public disclosure].

Gov't Code § 552.131(a), (b). Section 552.131(a) excepts from disclosure only “trade secret[s] of [a] business prospect” and “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.* This aspect of section 552.131 is co-extensive with section 552.110 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.110(a)-(b). Because we have already disposed of La Villita’s claims under section 552.110, the city may not withhold any of La Villita’s remaining information under section 552.131(a) of the Government Code. Furthermore, we note section 552.131(b) is designed to protect the interests of governmental bodies, not third parties. As we have already addressed the city’s claims under section 552.131(b), we conclude no portion of the remaining information is excepted under section 552.131(b) of the Government Code.

We understand La Villita to assert some of the remaining information is excepted under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” *Id.* § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. This office has also found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992) (personal financial information includes choice of particular insurance carrier), 523 (1989) (common-law privacy protects credit reports, financial statements, and other personal financial information), 373 (1983) (sources of income not related to financial transaction between individual and governmental body protected under common-law privacy). We note common-law privacy protects the interests of individuals, not those of corporate and other business entities. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 620 (1993) (corporation has no right to privacy), 192 (1978) (right to privacy is designed primarily to protect human feelings and sensibilities, rather than property, business, or other pecuniary interests); *see also Rosen v. Matthews Constr. Co.*, 777 S.W.2d 434 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1989) (corporation has no right to privacy (citing *United States v. Morton Salt Co.*, 338 U.S. 632, 652 (1950))), *rev’d* on other grounds, 796 S.W.2d 692 (Tex. 1990). We also note an individual’s name, education, prior employment, and personal information are not ordinarily private information subject to common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 554 (1990), 448 (1986).

Upon review, we find the information we have marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, the city has failed to demonstrate the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Thus, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.131(b) of the Government Code. The city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. To the extent the individuals whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the city must withhold the cellular telephone numbers of city employees within the remaining responsive information under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the city may not withhold the cellular telephone numbers if a governmental body pays for the cellular telephone service. The city must withhold the e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137, unless the owner affirmatively consents to release of his e-mail address. The city must generally withhold La Villita's customer and reference information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code; however, the city may not withhold La Villita's customer and reference information to the extent such information is publicly available on its website. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. 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 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,



Lee Seidlits
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CLS/som

Ref: ID# 596551

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Shann M. Chaudhry
Counsel for La Villita Del Rio Development, Ltd.
103 South Winston Lane
San Antonio, Texas 78213
(w/o enclosures)