



January 13, 2015

Mr. Matthew K. Behrens
Assistant City Attorney
Office of the City Attorney
City of El Paso
P.O. Box 1890
El Paso, Texas 79950-1890

OR2015-00602

Dear Mr. Behrens:

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# 547893 (ORR No. W031763).

The City of El Paso (the "city") received a request for information referencing "the water, water fee, water impact fee, nonresidential water fee or electric fee, [or] electric impact fee" involving certain named individuals during a specified time period.¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.106, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the submitted information contains information that is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides, in relevant part, the following:

(a) [T]he following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

¹The submitted information demonstrates the requestor amended her request for information. See Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (stating that if information requested is unclear to governmental body or if a large amount of information has been requested, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify or narrow request, but may not inquire into purpose for which information will be used).

(1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108; [and]

...

(5) all working papers, research material, and information used to estimate the need for or expenditure of public funds or taxes by a governmental body, on completion of the estimate[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1), (5). The submitted evaluation that was completed for the city is subject to section 552.022(a)(1) and the submitted proposed budget estimates are subject to section 552.022(a)(5). The city asserts the information subject to section 552.022 is excepted from release under sections 552.106 and 552.111 of the Government Code. However, these sections are discretionary and do not make information confidential under the Act. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions), 470 at 7 (1987) (deliberative process privilege under statutory predecessor to section 552.111 subject to waiver). Therefore, the city may not withhold the information subject to section 552.022 under section 552.106 or section 552.111. As no further exceptions are raised for the information subject to section 552.022, which we have marked, the city must release this information to the requestor. However, we will address the city's arguments for the information not subject to section 552.022.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides, in relevant part, the following:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

...

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). A governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that the section 552.103(a) exception applies in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received the request for information, and (2) the requested information is related to that litigation. *See Univ. of Tex.*

Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found., 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, orig. proceeding); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). The governmental body must meet both parts of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a). *See* ORD 551 at 4.

The question of whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). To establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office with “concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture.” *Id.* Concrete evidence to support a claim that litigation is reasonably anticipated may include, for example, the governmental body’s receipt of a letter containing a specific threat to sue the governmental body from an attorney for a potential opposing party. Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be “realistically contemplated”). On the other hand, this office has determined if an individual publicly threatens to bring suit against a governmental body, but does not actually take objective steps toward filing suit, litigation is not reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982).

You state the information in Exhibit E relates to an increase to the franchise fee charged to the El Paso Water Utility (“EPWU”) adopted in the city’s 2015 budget. You argue the city anticipated litigation on the day it received the instant request for information because the city was involved in litigation regarding a challenge to a different rate structure that was similar to the EPWU franchise fee at issue. Thus, you contend the plaintiffs at issue in the previous case could also challenge the EPWU franchise fee at issue. However, you have not demonstrated any party had taken concrete steps toward filing litigation when the city received the request. Thus, we find you have failed to establish the city reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the instant request for information. Therefore, Exhibit E may not be withheld under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. Gov’t Code § 552.107(1). 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 in Exhibit D consists of attorney-client privileged communications between city attorneys and city employees, as well as employees and board members of the EPWU, the city’s municipally-owned water utility. You further state these communications were made for the purpose of effectuating legal representation and the communications have been kept confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information in Exhibit D. Thus, the city may withhold Exhibit D under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.²

You assert the remaining information in Exhibit C is excepted from disclosure under section 552.111 of the Government Code, which excepts from disclosure “[a]n interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.111. This exception encompasses the deliberative process privilege. *See* Open Records Decision No. 615 at 2 (1993). The purpose of section 552.111 is to protect advice, opinion, and recommendation in the decisional process and to encourage open and frank discussion in the deliberative process. *See Austin v. City of San Antonio*, 630 S.W.2d 391, 394 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1982, orig. proceeding); Open Records Decision No. 538 at 1-2 (1990).

In Open Records Decision No. 615, this office re-examined the statutory predecessor to section 552.111 in light of the decision in *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, orig. proceeding). We determined section 552.111 excepts from disclosure only those internal communications that consist of

²We note some of the information in Exhibit D is also located in Exhibit C. As our ruling for Exhibit D is dispositive, we do not address your other arguments to withhold this information in Exhibit C.

advice, recommendations, opinions, and other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the governmental body. ORD 615 at 5; *see also City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351, 364 (Tex. 2000); *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Texas Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.). A governmental body's policymaking functions do include administrative and personnel matters of broad scope that affect the governmental body's policy mission. *See* Open Records Decision No. 631 at 3 (1995). However, a governmental body's policymaking functions do not encompass routine internal administrative or personnel matters, and disclosure of information about such matters will not inhibit free discussion of policy issues among agency personnel. ORD 615 at 5-6; *see also Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d at 364 (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking).

Further, section 552.111 does not generally except from disclosure facts and written observations of facts and events that are severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 37 S.W.3d at 157; ORD 615 at 5. But, if factual information is so inextricably intertwined with material involving advice, opinion, or recommendation as to make severance of the factual data impractical, the factual information also may be withheld under section 552.111. *See* Open Records Decision No. 313 at 3 (1982).

Section 552.111 can also encompass communications between a governmental body and a third party, including a consultant or other party with a privity of interest. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 631 at 2 (section 552.111 encompasses information created for governmental body by outside consultant acting at governmental body's request and performing task that is within governmental body's authority), 561 at 9 (1990) (section 552.111 encompasses communications with party with which governmental body has privity of interest or common deliberative process), 462 at 14 (1987) (section 552.111 applies to memoranda prepared by governmental body's consultants). For section 552.111 to apply, the governmental body must identify the third party and explain the nature of its relationship with the governmental body. Section 552.111 is not applicable to a communication between the governmental body and a third party unless the governmental body establishes it has a privity of interest or common deliberative process with the third party. *See* ORD 561 at 9.

You state the remaining information in Exhibit C consists of communications between employees and representatives of the city and employees and representatives of EPWU. You also state the communications pertain to policy issues pending before the city. We conclude the city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code.³ However, we find the remaining information at issue consists of routine administrative information, purely factual information, or information that was communicated with individuals you have failed to demonstrate share a privity of interest or common deliberative process with the city. Thus, we find you have failed to demonstrate

³As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

how the remaining information at issue is excepted under section 552.111. Accordingly, the remaining information in Exhibit C may not be withheld under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Section 552.106 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[a] draft or working paper involved in the preparation of proposed legislation.” Gov’t Code § 552.106(a). Section 552.106 resembles section 552.111 in that both exceptions protect advice, opinion, and recommendation on policy matters in order to encourage frank discussion during the policymaking process. *See* Open Records Decision No. 460 at 2 (1987). However, section 552.106 applies specifically to the legislative process and is narrower than section 552.111. *Id.* Therefore, section 552.106 is applicable only to the policy judgments, recommendations, and proposals of persons who are involved in the preparation of proposed legislation and who have an official responsibility to provide such information to members of the legislative body. *Id.* Section 552.106 does not protect purely factual information from public disclosure. *See id.*; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 344 at 3-4 (1982) (for purposes of statutory predecessor, factual information prepared by State Property Tax Board did not reflect policy judgments, recommendations, or proposals concerning drafting of legislation). Upon review of your arguments, we find you have not demonstrated the remaining information in Exhibit C consists of policy judgments, recommendations, or proposals pertaining to the preparation of proposed legislation. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the remaining information at issue under section 552.106 of the Government Code.

We note some of the remaining information in Exhibit C may be subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code.⁴ 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 an institutional e-mail address, the general e-mail address of a business, an e-mail address of a person who has a contractual relationship with a governmental body, an e-mail address of a vendor who seeks to contract with a governmental body, an e-mail address maintained by a governmental entity for one of its officials or employees, or an e-mail address provided to a governmental body on a letterhead. *See id.* § 552.137(c). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the e-mail addresses in the remaining information in Exhibit C under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless their owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure or subsection (c) applies.

In summary, the city must release the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.022 of the Government Code. The city may withhold Exhibit D under

⁴The 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).

section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The city may withhold the information we have marked in Exhibit C under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the e-mail addresses in the remaining information in Exhibit C under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless their owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure or subsection (c) applies. 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, 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,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Britni Fabian".

Britni Fabian
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

BF/bhf

Ref: ID# 547893

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)