



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

December 17, 2007

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

OR2007-16623

Dear Ms. Grace:

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# 297368.

The City of Austin (the "city") received a request for information related to the city's Revitalization Authority (the "authority"). You state that you have released a portion of the requested information to the requestor. You claim that portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107, 552.111, and 552.116 of the Government Code. You also contend that release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of the authority and Urban Renewal Authority ("URA"). Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, that you notified the authority and URA of the request and of their rights to submit arguments to this office as to why the information should not be released.<sup>1</sup> *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under the Act in certain circumstances). We have considered the

---

<sup>1</sup>You inform us that the city does not possess any information that URA considers proprietary.

exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information, a portion of which consists of a representative sample of information.<sup>2</sup>

Initially, you acknowledge that for a portion of the submitted information, the city failed to meet the deadlines prescribed by section 552.301 of the Government Code. *See Gov't Code* § 552.301(b), (e). 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 section 552.302); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). The presumption that information is public under section 552.302 can generally be overcome by demonstrating that the information is confidential by law or third-party interests are at stake. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 630 at 3 (1994), 325 at 2 (1982). Because third party interests are at stake in this instance, we will consider if any of the untimely submitted information must be withheld to protect the third party's interest.

We note that an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of a governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) of the Government Code to submit its reasons, if any, as to why requested information relating to that party should be withheld from disclosure. *See Gov't Code* § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, the authority has not submitted comments to this office explaining why any portion of the submitted information relating to it should not be released to the requestor. Thus, we have no basis to conclude that the release of any portion of the submitted information relating to the authority would implicate its proprietary interests. *See id.* § 552.110; Open Records Decision Nos. 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 661 at 5-6 (1999) (stating that business enterprise that claims exception for commercial or financial information under section 552.110(b) must show by specific factual evidence that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm). Accordingly, we conclude that the city may not withhold any portion of the submitted information pertaining to the authority on the basis of any proprietary interests that the authority may have in that information.

You claim that Exhibit B is excepted under section 552.107 of the Government Code. Section 552.107(1) protects information within the attorney-client privilege. When asserting

---

<sup>2</sup>We assume that 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.

the attorney-client privilege under section 552.107, 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 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, and lawyer representatives. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1)(A)-(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).

You state that the information contained in Exhibit B consists of communications between city employees, city council members, and city attorneys. You also state that these communications were made in confidence for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the city, and that their confidentiality has been maintained. Based on our review of your representations and the information at issue, we find that you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information contained in Exhibit B. Accordingly, we conclude that the city may withhold this information pursuant to section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.116 of the Government Code provides as follows:

(a) An audit working paper of an audit of the state auditor or the auditor of a state agency, an institution of higher education as defined by Section 61.003, Education Code, a county, a municipality, or a joint board operating under Section 22.074, Transportation Code, is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021. If information in an audit working paper is also maintained in another record, that other record is not excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 by this section.

(b) In this section:

(1) "Audit" means an audit authorized or required by a statute of this state or the United States, the charter or an ordinance of a municipality, an order of the commissioners court of a county, or a resolution or other action of a joint board described by Subsection (a) and includes an investigation.

(2) "Audit working paper" includes all information, documentary or otherwise, prepared or maintained in conducting an audit or preparing an audit report, including:

(A) intra-agency and interagency communications; and

(B) drafts of the audit report or portions of those drafts.

Gov't Code § 552.116. You state that the information contained in Exhibit C consists of investigative audit working papers that are maintained by the city's Corporate Internal Audit Manager. You state that this audit was conducted under the authority granted by section 2-3-5 of the Austin City Code. Based on our review and your representations, we find you have sufficiently demonstrated that this information was prepared or maintained by the city's auditors in conducting audits authorized or required by an ordinance of the city. *See id.* § 552.116(a), (b)(1), (b)(2). Accordingly, the city may withhold Exhibit C under section 552.116 of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup>

We note that the remaining information contains e-mail addresses subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code.<sup>4</sup> Section 552.137 excepts from disclosure "an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with

---

<sup>3</sup>As our ruling is dispositive with regard to this information, we need not address your argument under section 552.111.

<sup>4</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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 id.* § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail addresses we have marked in the remaining information are not of a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). Therefore, the city must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked in accordance with section 552.137 unless the city receives consent for their release.

In summary, the city may withhold Exhibit B under section 552.107 of the Government Code and Exhibit C under section 552.116 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked in accordance with section 552.137 unless the city receives consent for their release. The remaining information must be released.

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 file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, 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, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, 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 challenge 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 Office of the Attorney General 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. 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,



Jordan Johnson  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JJ/eeg

Ref: ID# 297368

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Sarah Coppola  
Austin American Statesman  
305 South Congress Avenue  
Austin, Texas 78704  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Byron C. Marshall  
Austin Revitalization Authority  
1105 Navasota Street  
Austin, Texas 78702  
(w/o enclosures)

Urban Renewal Agency  
c/o Susan Rocha  
Denton, Navarro, Rocha & Bernal, P.C.  
2517 North Main Avenue  
San Antonio, Texas 78212-3111  
(w/o enclosures)