



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

February 3, 2006

Mr. Derek Seal
General Counsel
Texas Commission on Environmental Quality
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, Texas 78711-3087

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

OR2006-01167

Dear Mr. Seal and 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# 241833.

The Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (the "commission") received a request for information pertaining to the Falcon Refinery in Ingleside, Texas. The General Counsel and the Litigation Division of the commission submitted separate responsive documents that each wishes to withhold from disclosure. The General Counsel states that some of the requested information has been released or made available to the requestor but asserts that the information it submitted is excepted under sections 552.101, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. The Litigation Division asserts that a portion of the information it submitted is excepted under section 552.101 of the Government Code but states that it has released the remaining responsive information. We have considered the claimed exceptions and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

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

The General Counsel asserts that the information it submitted is excepted under section 552.107 of the Government Code. 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 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. 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)(A), (B), (C), (D), (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 writ). 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).

The General Counsel asserts that the information it submitted consists of confidential communications that were prepared by the general counsel of the commission in the course of his duties to provide legal advice to the Commissioners and that contain confidential legal advice. Based on these representations and our review of the information at issue, we agree that the information submitted by the General Counsel consists of privileged attorney-client communications that the commission may withhold under section 552.107 of the Government Code. As our ruling on this issue is dispositive of the information submitted by the General Counsel, we do not address the General Counsel’s remaining arguments.

The Litigation Division claims that a portion of the information it submitted is excepted under section 552.101 of the Government Code. Section 552.101 excepts from public disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. This exception encompasses information protected by the informer’s privilege, which has long been recognized by Texas courts. See *Aguilar v. State*, 444 S.W.2d 935, 937 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969); *Hawthorne v. State*, 10 S.W.2d 724, 725 (Tex. Crim. App. 1928). The informer’s privilege protects from disclosure the identities of persons who report activities over which the governmental body has criminal or quasi-criminal law-enforcement authority, provided that the subject of the information does not already know the informer’s identity. Open Records Decision Nos. 515 at 3 (1988), 208 at 1-2 (1978). The informer’s privilege protects the identities of individuals who report violations of statutes to the police or similar law-enforcement agencies, as well as those who report violations of statutes with civil or criminal penalties to “administrative officials having a duty of inspection or of law enforcement within their particular spheres.” Open Records Decision No. 279 at 2 (1981); Wigmore, Evidence, § 2374, at 767 (McNaughton rev. ed. 1961). The report must be of a violation of a criminal or civil statute. See Open Records Decision Nos. 582 at 2 (1990), 515 at 4-5 (1988).

You inform us that the submitted information pertains to the investigation of a complaint. You state that the complainant alleged a possible violation of section 382.085(a) of the Health and Safety Code and section 101.4 of title 30 of the Texas Administrative Code. You inform us that the commission is authorized to enforce these provisions. You also state that the alleged violations could result in the imposition of administrative or civil penalties. Having examined these provisions, your arguments, and the documents at issue, we conclude that, pursuant to the informer’s privilege and section 552.101, the commission may withhold the information identifying the complainant, which the Litigation Division has marked.

In summary, the commission may withhold the information submitted by the General Counsel under section 552.107 of the Government Code. The commission may also withhold the information identifying the complainant, which the Litigation Division has marked in the document it submitted under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the informer’s privilege. The remaining submitted information must be released.

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 appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full

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

Sincerely,



L. Joseph James
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LJJ/segh

Ref: ID# 241833

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Sheri Larson
URS Corporation
3010 LBJ Freeway, Suite 1300
Dallas, Texas 75236
(w/o enclosures)