



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

April 2, 2008

Ms. Mary R. Risner
Director
Litigation Division
Texas Commission on Environmental Quality
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, Texas 78711-3087

OR2008-04410

Dear Ms. Risner:

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# 306257.

The Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (the "commission") received a request for "all updated information on the [voluntary cleanup status] and what remains for the state to clear the [specified] site." You state that some of the information will be released to the requestor. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 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 because the request is for information relating to a specified site, some of the submitted information is not responsive to the instant request. The commission need not release non-responsive information in response to this request and this ruling will not address that information. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dism'd). We have marked this information accordingly.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code, the litigation exception, provides in relevant part as follows:

(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 city has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in this particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the request for information is received, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, no pet.); *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). The city must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a).

The question of whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. See Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). When the governmental body is the prospective plaintiff in litigation, the evidence of anticipated litigation must at least reflect that litigation involving a specific matter is "realistically contemplated." See Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989); see also Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982) (investigatory file may be withheld if governmental body's attorney determines that it should be withheld pursuant to Gov't Code § 552.103 and that litigation is "reasonably likely to result").

You state that the submitted information relates to efforts to remediate the contaminated groundwater under the property at issue and an adjacent site. The commission explains one of the property owners submitted a Municipal Settings Designation ("MSD") application to the commission, but the application process cannot be completed until the City of Carrollton passes a referendum regarding a water well on the site. You indicate to our office that "because the MSD process has not been finalized yet, it is probable that the [commission] may need to recover state funds expended to remediate" the specified site through a cost recovery action. Based on your representations and our review, we determine that for purposes of section 552.103, you have established that the commission reasonably anticipated litigation on the date that it received the request for information. Further, we find

that the responsive information relates to the anticipated litigation. Accordingly, the commission may withhold this information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.¹

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

¹As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure.

contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Henisha D. Anderson". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name being the most prominent.

Henisha D. Anderson
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

HDA/mcf

Ref: ID# 306257

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. John Carney
John H. Carney & Associates
One Meadows 5005 Greenville
Dallas, Texas 75206
(w/o enclosures)