



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

February 2, 2005

Ms. Lisa A. Hayes
Assistant City Attorney
The City of El Paso
2 Civic Center Plaza- 9th Floor
El Paso, Texas 79901

OR2005-00970

Dear Ms. Hayes:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 218054.

The City of El Paso (the "city") received a request for "any document relating to a change in the interpretation of the parking requirements of a strip center from the aggregate total of the individual uses of the strip center to 5 spaces per 1000 square feet (shopping center) regardless of the individual uses." You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107 and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that the information responsive to this request was the subject of a previous ruling from this office. In Open Records Letter No. 2005-00251 (2005), we concluded that the city may withhold the information submitted in that instance under section 552.107 of the Government Code. Therefore, assuming that the four criteria for a "previous determination" established by this office in Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) have been met, we conclude that the city may continue to rely on our decision in Open Records Letter No. 2005-00251 with respect to the information that was previously ruled upon in that decision.¹ See Gov't Code § 552.301(f); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001).

¹ The four criteria for this type of "previous determination" are 1) the records or information at issue are precisely the same records or information that were previously submitted to this office pursuant to section 552.301(e)(1)(D) of the Government Code; 2) the governmental body which received the request for the records or information is the same governmental body that previously requested and received a ruling from the attorney general; 3) the attorney general's prior ruling concluded that the precise records or information are or are not excepted from disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"); and 4) the law, facts, and circumstances on which the prior attorney general ruling was based have not changed since the issuance of the ruling. See Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001).

We now turn to your arguments for the submitted information. Pursuant to section 552.301(e), a governmental body is required to submit to this office within fifteen business days of receiving an open records request (1) general written comments stating the reasons why the stated exceptions apply that would allow the information to be withheld, (2) a copy of the written request for information, (3) a signed statement or sufficient evidence showing the date the governmental body received the written request, and (4) a copy of the specific information requested or representative samples, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the documents. Upon review of the submitted documents we note, and you agree, that they were responsive to the initial request for information that was the subject of our previous ruling, Open Records Letter No. 2005-000251. Thus, the city was required to submit this information in response to the initial request for information by November 3, 2004. However, the city did not submit this information to us until November 22, 2004. Therefore, the city failed to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 of the Government Code in regard to the submitted information.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the information is public and must be released. Information that is presumed public must be released unless a governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information to overcome this presumption. *See Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.302); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). Normally, a compelling interest is demonstrated when some other source of law makes the information at issue confidential or third-party interests are at stake. *See* Open Records Decision No. 150 at 2 (1977). Although the city claims that the information at issue is excepted from disclosure pursuant to sections 552.107 and 552.111 of the Government Code, we note that your claimed exceptions to disclosure are discretionary and may be waived by a governmental body's failure to comply with section 552.301.² *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 11-12 (2002) (claim of attorney-client privilege under section 552.107 or Texas Rule of Evidence 503 does not provide compelling reason for purposes of section 552.302 if it does not implicate third party rights). Accordingly, we conclude that the city may not withhold any portion of the submitted information under either section 552.107 or section

² Discretionary exceptions are intended to protect only the interests of the governmental body, as distinct from exceptions which are intended to protect information deemed confidential by law or the interests of third parties. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 630 at 4 (1994) (governmental body may waive attorney-client privilege, section 552.107(1)), 551 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.103 serves only to protect governmental body's position in litigation and does not itself make information confidential), 473 (1987) (governmental body may waive section 552.111), 522 at 4 (1989) (discretionary exceptions in general); *see also Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103). Discretionary exceptions, therefore, do not generally provide compelling reasons for withholding requested information from disclosure.

552.111 of the Government Code. As you raise no other exceptions to disclosure, the submitted 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,



Lauren E. Kleine
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LEK/jev

Ref: ID# 218054

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Robert T. Pearson
Pearson & Pearson
214 West Franklin Avenue
El Paso, Texas 79901-1120
(w/o enclosures)