



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

May 3, 2012

Ms. Tiffany N. Evans
Assistant City Attorney
City of Houston
P.O. Box 368
Houston, Texas 77001-0368

OR2012-06462

Dear Ms. Evans:

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# 453199 (GC No. 19354).

The Houston Airport System (the "system") received a request for five categories of e-mails between named individuals and certain entities during a specified time period.¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107 and 552.131 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 that comes 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. *See* 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. *See* 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

¹We note the system sought and received clarification of the request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (governmental body may communicate with requestor for purpose of clarifying or narrowing request for information); *see also* *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or over-broad request for public information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

facilitating professional legal services to the client governmental body. *See 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 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. *See* 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. *See Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, orig. proceeding). 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 raise section 552.107(1) for Exhibit 2. You state Exhibit 2 consists of communications between a City of Houston attorney, as legal representative of the system, and system staff that were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the system. You have identified the parties to the communications in Exhibit 2. You further state the communications at issue were intended to be, and have remained, confidential. Based on these representations and our review of the information at issue, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to Exhibit 2. Accordingly, the system may withhold Exhibit 2 under section 552.107(1).²

You also raise section 552.131(a) of the Government Code for Exhibit 3. Section 552.131 of the Government Code provides, in part, as follows:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if the information relates to economic development negotiations involving a governmental body and a business prospect that the governmental body seeks to have locate, stay, or expand in or near the territory of the governmental body and the information relates to:

²As our ruling is dispositive for Exhibit 2, we need not address your remaining argument against its release.

- (1) a trade secret of the business prospect; or
- (2) commercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that disclosure would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained.

Gov't Code § 552.131(a). We note the scope of section 552.131(a) is co-extensive with that of section 552.110 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.110(a)-(b); Open Records Decision Nos. 552 at 5 (1990), 661 at 5-6 (1999). Thus, section 552.131(a) protects the proprietary interests of third parties that have provided information to governmental bodies, not the interests of governmental bodies themselves. Therefore, we do not address the system's arguments under section 552.131(a). In this instance, there has been no demonstration by a third party that any of the information at issue constitutes a trade secret or that release of any of the information at issue would cause a third party substantial competitive harm. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 552 at 5 (attorney general will accept private person's claim under Gov't Code § 552.110(a) if person establishes *prima facie* case for trade secret exception, and no one submits argument that rebuts claim as matter of law), 661 at 5-6 (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm). We therefore conclude the system may not withhold any of Exhibit 3 under section 552.131(a).

In summary, the system may withhold Exhibit 2 under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. Exhibit 3 must be released.

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,



Ana Carolina Vieira
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

ACV/ag

Ref: ID# 453199

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)