



OFFICE *of the* ATTORNEY GENERAL  
GREG ABBOTT

March 5, 2003

Mr. Paul Sarahan, Director  
Litigation Division  
Texas Commission on Environmental Quality  
P.O. Box 13087  
Austin, Texas 78711-3097

OR2003-1458

Dear Mr. Sarahan:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 177389.

The Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (the "commission") received a request for

[a]ll documents, **including emails and electronic files**, related to the [El Campo Facility] and any permits, registrations, enforcement actions, VCP or other clean-up actions or other actions at the facility/site involving [the commission] that have been prepared by or for [the commission] or submitted to or filed with [the commission] since January 1, 2002.

You state that you have released some of the requested information to the requestor. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.107, 552.111, and 552.137 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

You claim that information in Tabs One and Two is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103. Section 552.103 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). The commission maintains the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the governmental body receives the request for information and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *See University of Tex. Law Sch. v. Texas Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, no pet.); *see also Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1<sup>st</sup> Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990); Gov't Code § 552.103(c). The commission must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a).

To establish that 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.” Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Concrete evidence to support a claim that 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. Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be “realistically contemplated”). On the other hand, this office has determined that 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). Nor does the mere fact that an individual hires an attorney and alleges damages serve to establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated. Open Records Decision No. 361 at 2 (1983). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986).

In this case, you state that the commission “has already been sued over this facility once. It is very possible that the agency may be sued again in the future, especially considering the highly sensitive nature of the subject matter, the length of the ongoing investigation, and the current lawsuit between many of the well owners and those entities conducting the investigation.” You further inform this office that the requested information relates to a site that is contaminated with hazardous substances and state that “[i]f the entities presently addressing the site became recalcitrant parties and the [commission] takes over the investigation efforts, the [commission] would be entitled to pursue a cost recovery action against all parties responsible for such contamination under Section 361.197 of the Texas Health and Safety Code.”

Finally, you state that such litigation is required to be filed pursuant to this section in the event the commission assumes the investigation efforts. However, after considering the totality of the circumstances, we find that the commission has not shown that concrete steps toward litigation have been taken. Thus, we do not believe that you have established that litigation was reasonably anticipated at the time the commission received the records request. *See* ORD 361. Accordingly, you may not withhold any of the submitted information based on section 552.103.

You also argue that information in Tabs One and Two is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code. 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). After reviewing the information submitted in Tabs One and Two, we agree that all of the information you seek

to withhold in Tab One, and the entirety of Tab Two, are excepted from disclosure under section 552.107(1) and may be withheld.

You finally claim that an e-mail address highlighted in Tab Three is excepted from disclosure under section 552.137 of the Government Code. Section 552.137 provides that “[a]n e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body is confidential and not subject to disclosure under [the Public Information Act].” See Gov’t Code § 552.137(a). You do not state that the individual to whom the e-mail address belongs has consented to its release. Accordingly, the commission must withhold the e-mail address in Tab Three under section 552.137 of the Government Code. See Gov’t Code § 552.137.

In summary, the commission may withhold from disclosure the information you seek to withhold in Tab One, and the entirety of Tab Two, under section 552.107(1). You must withhold the e-mail address you have highlighted in Tab Three under section 552.137. The remaining information must be released to the requestor.

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,



V.G. Schimmel  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

VGS/sdk

Ref: ID# 177389

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Mr. Richard W. Lowerre  
Lowerre & Kelly  
P.O. Box 1167  
Austin, Texas 78767-1167  
(w/o enclosures)