



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

October 26, 2010

Mr. Hyattye O. Simmons
General Counsel
Dallas Area Rapid Transit
P.O. Box 660163
Dallas, Texas 75266-0163

OR2010-16189

Dear Mr. Simmons:

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# 399787 (DART ORR #7660).

The Dallas Area Rapid Transit ("DART") received a request for seven specified categories of information related to rail line construction at a specified location. You state DART released some of the requested information. You claim some of the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code. You also indicate sections 552.101, 552.110, 552.113, and 552.131 of the Government Code may be applicable to some of the submitted information, but take no position as to whether this information is excepted under that section. Instead, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified Union Pacific Railroad and Lonnie E. Blaydes Consulting ("LBC") of DART's receipt of the request for information and of the right of each to submit arguments to this office as to why the requested information should not be released to the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 at 3 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in the Act in certain circumstances). In correspondence to this office, United Pacific Railroad informs us it does not object to the disclosure of the submitted information. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

¹We assume 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 those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

DART asserts Exhibit B-1 is excepted under section 552.107 of the Government Code. Section 552.107(1) 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 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 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, and lawyer representatives. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). 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.*, 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 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 explain the information in Exhibit B-1 constitutes confidential communications between attorneys for and employees of DART that were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services. You also assert the communications were intended to be confidential and their confidentiality has been maintained. After reviewing your arguments and the submitted information, we agree the submitted information in Exhibit B-1 constitutes privileged attorney-client communications that DART may withhold under section 552.107.

An interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body’s notice under section 552.305(d) to submit its reasons, if any, as to why requested information relating to it should be withheld from disclosure. *See Gov’t Code* § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, LBC has not submitted to this office any

reasons explaining why the requested information should not be released. We thus have no basis for concluding any portion of the submitted information constitutes proprietary information of that company. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3. Accordingly, DART may not withhold any of the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest LBC may have in it.

Some of the remaining information is excepted under section 552.137 of the Government Code.² 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 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* Gov’t Code § 552.137(a)-(c). Section 552.137 does not apply to a government employee’s work e-mail address because such an address is not that of the employee as a “member of the public,” but is instead the address of the individual as a government employee. The e-mail addresses at issue do not appear to be of a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). You do not inform us a member of the public has affirmatively consented to the release of any e-mail address contained in the submitted materials. Therefore, DART must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137.³

To conclude, DART may withhold Exhibit B-1 under section 552.107 of the Government Code. DART must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code. DART must release the remaining information to the requestor.

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,

²The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 at 2 (1987), 480 at 5 (1987); *see e.g.*, Open Records Decision No. 470 at 2 (1987) (because release of confidential information could impair rights of third parties and because improper release constitutes a misdemeanor, attorney general will raise predecessor statute of section 552.101 on behalf of governmental bodies).

³We note this office issued Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009), a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold ten categories of information, including an e-mail address of a member of the public under section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general opinion.

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,

James L. Coggeshall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JLC/tp

Ref: ID# 399787

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Doris A. Beutel-Guthrie
United Pacific Railroad
1001 McKinney, Suite 900
Houston, Texas 77002
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Lonnie E. Blaydes
Lonnie E. Blaydes Consulting
8122 San Benito Way
Dallas, Texas 75218
(w/o enclosures)