



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

May 6, 2011

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

OR2011-06262

Dear Ms. Grace:

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# 416662.

The City of Austin (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to "easements and other real estate concerns related to the pending Lady Bird Lake boardwalk/trail project." You state the city will make most of the responsive information available to the requestor. You claim that portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.105 and 552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.¹

Section 552.105 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information that relates to:

- ...
- (2) appraisals or purchase price of real or personal property for a public purpose prior to the formal award of contracts for the property.

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.

Gov't Code § 552.105(2). Section 552.105 is designed to protect a governmental body's planning and negotiating position with respect to particular transactions. Open Records Decision Nos. 564 at 2 (1990), 357 (1982), 310 (1982). Information that is excepted from disclosure under section 552.105 that pertains to such negotiations may be excepted from disclosure so long as the transaction relating to that information is not complete. *See* ORD 310. But the protection offered by section 552.105 is not limited solely to transactions not yet finalized. This office has concluded that information about specific parcels of land obtained in advance of other parcels to be acquired for the same project could be withheld where release of the information would harm the governmental body's negotiating position with respect to the remaining parcels. *See* ORD 564 at 2. A governmental body may withhold information "which, if released, would impair or tend to impair [its] 'planning and negotiating position in regard to particular transactions.'" ORD 357 at 3 (quoting Open Records Decision No. 222 (1979)). The question of whether specific information, if publicly released, would impair a governmental body's planning and negotiating position with regard to particular transactions is a question of fact. Accordingly, this office will accept a governmental body's good-faith determination in this regard, unless the contrary is clearly shown as a matter of law. *See* ORD 564.

You state the city is currently involved in completing final design adjustments and easement acquisitions for the boardwalk trail on Ladybird Lake and will bid this summer for construction over the next two years. You state release of the information you marked would harm the city's negotiating position with respect to the purchase of the easements. Based on your representations and our review, we conclude the city may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.105 of the Government Code.

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 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, and lawyer representatives. *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. *See 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 state the information you have marked consists of communications between city personnel in the contract and land management, public works, and parks and recreation departments and a city attorney for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of legal services. You state the communications were confidential and that the city has not waived confidentiality. Accordingly, we conclude the city may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.105 of the Government Code and section 552.107 of the Government Code. 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.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,



Laura Ream Lemus
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LRL/tf

Ref: ID# 416662

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)