



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

June 19, 2014

Ms. Elaine Nicholson  
Assistant City Attorney  
Law Department  
City of Austin  
P.O. Box 1088  
Austin, Texas 78767-8828

OR2014-10573

Dear Ms. Nicholson:

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# 526513.

The City of Austin (the "city") received a request for the following four categories of information: all contracts with any entity or person that are related to a specified project; all insurance policies, indemnity agreements, and bonding agreements related to the specified project; all plans, specifications, and documentation reflecting the time line of the specified project; and a list of all businesses and individuals performed work under contract for the specified project. You claim some of the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.

Initially, we note you have only submitted certain e-mail communications that are responsive to a portion of the instant request. However, you have not submitted any information responsive to the remaining portions of the request. Although you state the city submitted a representative sample of the requested information, we find the submitted information is not representative of the other types of information to which the requestor seeks access. Please be advised, this open records letter ruling applies only to the type of information you have submitted for our review. This ruling does not authorize the city to withhold any information that is substantially different from the type of information you submitted to this

office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.302. Therefore, to the extent information responsive to the remaining portions of the request exists and was maintained by the city on the date it received the request, we assume the city has released it to the requestor. If the city has not released any such information, it must do so at this time. Gov't Code §§ 552.301(a), .302; Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (noting that if governmental body concludes that no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible under circumstances).

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 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 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 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 in a pending action and concerning a matter of common interest therein. *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 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 the information you have marked consists of confidential communications between city attorneys, legal staff, and city employees. You state these communications were made

in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the city. You further state the confidentiality of these communications has been maintained. Upon review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information you have marked. Thus, the city may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.117(a)(1) excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, emergency contact information, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials employees of a governmental body who request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). Section 552.117 is also applicable to cellular telephone numbers, provided the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-6 (1988) (statutory predecessor to section 552.117 of the Government Code not applicable to cellular telephone numbers provided and paid for by governmental body and intended for official use). Whether a particular piece of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time the request for it is made. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Therefore, a governmental body must withhold information under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee only if the individual made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for this information was made. Accordingly, if the individual whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality pursuant to section 552.024, the cellular telephone numbers we have marked must be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) if the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. The city may not withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) if the individual did not make a timely election to keep the information confidential or if the cellular telephone service is paid for by a governmental body.

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). The e-mail addresses at issue are not excluded by subsection (c). Therefore, the city must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless their owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure.

In summary, the city may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. If the individual whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality pursuant to section 552.024, the cellular telephone numbers we have marked must be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) if the cellular telephone

---

<sup>1</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. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

service is not paid for by a governmental body. The city must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless their owner affirmatively consents to their public disclosure. The remaining information 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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl\\_ruling\\_info.shtml](http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml), 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 may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Joseph Behnke  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JB/som

Ref: ID# 526513

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)