



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 23, 2016

Ms. Elaine Nicholson
Assistant City Attorney
City of Austin
P.O. Box 1088
Austin, Texas 78767-8828

OR2016-04240

Dear Ms. Nicholson:

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# 599380.

The City of Austin (the "city") received a request for all communications between the city and fourteen named entities. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.107 of the Government Code. You state release of portions of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of Austin FBO, LLC ("AFBO").¹ Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified AFBO of the request for information and of AFBO's right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information at issue 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 considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information, some of which consists of a representative sample of information.²

¹We note, and you acknowledge, the city did not comply with section 552.301 of the Government Code in requesting this decision. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(b), (e). Nonetheless, because third party interests and section 552.137 of the Government Code can provide compelling reasons to overcome the presumption of openness, we will consider their applicability to the information at issue. *See id.* §§ 552.007, .302, .352. The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

²We 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 that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

We note 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) of the Government Code to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See id.* § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received comments from AFBO explaining why its submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude this party has a protected proprietary interest in the information at issue. *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 any portion of the submitted information related to AFBO on the basis of any proprietary interest this party may have in the information.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides, in pertinent part:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

...

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). A governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date of the receipt of the request for information and (2) the informational issue is related to the pending or anticipated litigation. *Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997. orig. proceeding); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). A governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a).

To establish litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office "concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture." *See* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Concrete evidence to support

a claim litigation is reasonably anticipated may include, for example, the governmental body's receipt of a letter containing a specific threat to sue the governmental body from an attorney for a potential opposing party. *See* Open Records Decision No. 555(1990); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be "realistically contemplated"). In addition, this office has concluded litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party hired an attorney who made a demand for disputed payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, or when an individual threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 346 (1982), 288 (1981). On the other hand, this office has determined if an individual publicly threatens to bring suit against a governmental body, but does not actually take objective steps toward filing suit, litigation is not reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982). Further, the fact that a potential opposing party has hired an attorney who makes a request for information does not establish litigation is reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).

You seek to withhold some of the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code. You inform us, and provide documentation showing, prior to the city's receipt of the present request for information, the city and the requestor's client were engaged in mediation on the matter that gave rise to the request for information. You state the requestor's client "retained the right to sue the [c]ity" in the mediation agreement. The city provided documentation wherein the requestor states the city's position has made "court the only available route." You indicate the requestor has threatened litigation in the past and state "[t]he threats of litigation continue and have escalated in tone." You claim the information at issue directly relates to the issue under negotiation. Based on your representations and our review, we find the city reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the present request for information. Further, we find the city has demonstrated the information at issue relates to the anticipated litigation. Thus, the city may withhold the information it marked under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

However, once information has been obtained by all parties to the litigation through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to the opposing parties in the anticipated litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a), and it must be disclosed. Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

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 "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 a 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: (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. *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 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).

You state some of the remaining information relates to discussions between and amongst the city Law Department and the city Aviation Department. You indicate these communications were intended to be confidential and state the confidentiality has been maintained. Upon review, we find the city has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information it marked. Thus, the city may withhold the information it marked under section 552.107(1) 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). Gov’t Code § 552.137(a)-(c). Section 552.137 is not applicable to an institutional e-mail address, an Internet website address, an e-mail address that a governmental entity maintains for one of its officials or employees, or an e-mail address provided to a governmental body by a person who has or seeks a contractual relationship with the governmental body or by the contractor’s agent. *See id.* § 552.137(c). Because we are unable to discern whether the e-mail addresses within the information at issue fall within the scope of section 552.137(c), we must rule conditionally. To the extent the e-mail addresses at issue belong to members of the public, the city must withhold such e-mail addresses under section 552.137, unless the individuals to whom the

e-mail addresses belong affirmatively consent to their release. However, to the extent the e-mail addresses at issue are excluded by section 552.137(c), the city may not withhold these e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city may withhold the information it marked under section 552.103 of the Government Code. The city also may withhold the information it marked under section 552.107 of the Government Code. To the extent the e-mail addresses at issue belong to members of the public, the city must withhold such e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the individuals to whom the e-mail addresses belong affirmatively consent to their release. However, to the extent the e-mail addresses at issue are excluded by section 552.137(c) of the Government Code, the city may not withhold these e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.

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,



Ashley Crutchfield
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

AC/dls

Ref: ID# 599380

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Gary V. Woods
Manager
Austin FBO, LLC
c/o Ms. Alyson Garth
755 East Mulberry Avenue, Suite 600
San Antonio, Texas 78212
(w/o enclosures)