



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

March 16, 2010

Ms. Kathleen C. Decker
Office of Legal Services
Litigation Division
Texas Commission on Environmental Quality
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, Texas 78711-3087

OR2010-03698

Dear Ms. Decker:

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# 373844 (TCEQ PIR No 10.01.04.10).

The Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (the "commission") received a request for three categories of information pertaining to the Encycle and Nueces Bay Site (the "site"). You state you have made some of the requested information available to the requestor. You claim that the submitted 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.

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 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 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, lawyer representatives, and a lawyer representing another party or its representative, in a pending action and concerning a matter of common interest therein. *See* 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 pet.). 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 assert Exhibit C consists of and documents confidential communications between commission attorneys and commission staff. You state Exhibit E consists of a document containing a commission attorney’s notes intended to convey comments to a commission employee. Further, you state Exhibit D includes confidential communications between attorneys and staff of the commission, the Texas General Land Office (the “GLO”), and the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (the “department”). You inform us the commission, the GLO, and the department are designated by the governor to act as trustees for the natural resources of Texas. You explain these agencies “work together cooperatively in pursuit of compensation for natural resource injuries.” You assert the submitted communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal advice pertaining to the management of natural resource damages recovered for injuries sustained at the site, an issue in which the parties share a common interest. You further state the communications were intended to be confidential and that the confidentiality of the communications has been maintained. Upon review, we conclude the commission may withhold the submitted information under section 552.107 of the Government Code. *See* TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1)(C) (client has privilege to refuse to disclose and to prevent any other person from disclosing confidential communications made for purpose of facilitating rendition of professional legal services to lawyer or representative of lawyer representing another party in pending action and *concerning a matter of common interest therein*) (emphasis added); TEX. R. DISCIPLINARY CONDUCT 1.05(c)(1) (lawyer may reveal confidential information when

lawyer has been expressly authorized to do so in order to carry out representation); *In re Auclair*, 961 F.2d 65, 69 (5th Cir. 1992) (citing *Hodges, Grant & Kaufmann v. United States Government*, 768 F.2d 719, 721 (5th Cir. 1985)) (attorney-client privilege not waived if privileged communication is shared with third person who has common legal interest with respect to subject matter of communication); RESTATEMENT (THIRD) OF THE LAW GOVERNING LAWYERS § 76 (if two or more clients with common interest in litigated or nonlitigated matter and represented by separate lawyers agree to exchange information concerning the matter, communication of any such information that otherwise qualifies as privileged under §§ 68-72 and that relates to the matter is privileged as against third persons, and any such client may invoke privilege unless it has been waived by client that made communication). As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure.

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.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php, 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 must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Christina Alvarado
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CA/eb

Ref: ID# 373844

Enc. Submitted documents

cc: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)