



OFFICE *of the* ATTORNEY GENERAL  
GREG ABBOTT

September 29, 2003

Ms. Meredith Ladd  
Brown & Hofmeister, L.L.P.  
1717 Main Street, Suite 4300  
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2003-6806

Dear Ms. Ladd:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 188467.

The Town of Flower Mound (the "town"), which you represent, received a request for an ordinance pertaining to an interlocal boundary agreement, and "all correspondence between town staff, officials, etc. relating to annexation between period of Jan. 1, 2001 & current." You state that some responsive information has been released to the requestor. You claim that a portion of the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

When asserting the attorney-client privilege under section 552.107, 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. *Id.* at 6-7. 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

---

<sup>1</sup>Although you also raise the attorney work product privilege in the context of section 552.107 of the Government Code, this privilege is more properly deemed to be an aspect of section 552.111. See Open Records Decision No. 677 (2002). Thus, we will address your work product claim under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

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 is acting in capacity other than that of attorney). 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). Based upon your representations and our review of the information at issue, we find that portions of this information are privileged attorney-client communications. Therefore, the information that we have marked may be withheld under section 552.107.

We now turn to your argument under the attorney work product privilege for the remaining submitted information. Section 552.111 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “an interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency.” This section encompasses the attorney work product privilege found in rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. *City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351, 360 (Tex. 2000); Open Records Decision No. 677 at 4-8 (2002). Rule 192.5 defines work product as

(1) material prepared or mental impressions developed in anticipation of litigation or for trial by or for a party or a party's representatives, including the party's attorneys, consultants, sureties, indemnitors, insurers, employees, or agents; or

(2) a communication made in anticipation of litigation or for trial between a party and the party's representatives or among a party's representatives, including the party's attorneys, consultants, sureties, indemnitors, insurers, employees or agents.

A governmental body seeking to withhold information under this exception bears the burden of demonstrating that the information was created or developed for trial or in anticipation of litigation by or for a party or a party's representative. Tex. R. Civ. P. 192.5; ORD 677 at 6-8. In order for this office to conclude that the information was made or developed in anticipation of litigation, we must be satisfied that

a) a reasonable person would have concluded from the totality of the circumstances surrounding the investigation that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue; and b) the party resisting discovery believed in good faith that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue and [created or obtained the information] for the purpose of preparing for such litigation.

*Nat'l Tank Co. v. Brotherton*, 851 S.W.2d 193, 207 (Tex. 1993). A "substantial chance" of litigation does not mean a statistical probability, but rather "that litigation is more than merely an abstract possibility or unwarranted fear." *Id.* at 204; ORD 677 at 7.

After carefully reviewing your representations and the remaining submitted information, we find that the town has failed to adequately demonstrate that any portion of the information at issue was created for trial or in anticipation of litigation. Accordingly, we conclude that the town may not withhold any portion of the remaining submitted information as attorney work product under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Section 552.117 of the Government Code may also be applicable to some of the submitted information. Section 552.117(a)(1) excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, social security numbers, and family member information of current or

former officials or employees of a governmental body who request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024. 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, the town may only withhold information under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of current or former officials or employees who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for this information was made. For those employees who timely elected to keep their personal information confidential, the town must withhold the information that we have marked. The town may not withhold this information under section 552.117(a)(1) for those employees who did not make a timely election to keep the information confidential.

Finally, we note that some of the information otherwise marked for release contains e-mail addresses of members of the public.<sup>2</sup> Section 552.137 of the Government Code provides:

(a) Except as otherwise provided by this section, an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body is confidential and not subject to disclosure under this chapter.

(b) Confidential information described by this section that relates to a member of the public may be disclosed if the member of the public affirmatively consents to its release.

(c) Subsection (a) does not apply to an e-mail address:

(1) provided to a governmental body by a person who has a contractual relationship with the governmental body or by the contractor's agent;

---

<sup>2</sup>Some of the information submitted to this office was redacted prior to its submission to this office. While it is entirely appropriate that you have marked the specific information that you assert is excepted from disclosure - *see* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(2) - we advise that in the future, such marked information should be visible to this office so that this office may properly determine whether the specific information at issue is, in fact, subject to the claimed exception.

(2) provided to a governmental body by a vendor who seeks to contract with the governmental body or by the vendor's agent;

(3) contained in a response to a request for bids or proposals, contained in a response to similar invitations soliciting offers or information relating to a potential contract, or provided to a governmental body in the course of negotiating the terms of a contract or potential contract; or

(4) provided to a governmental body on a letterhead, coversheet, printed document, or other document made available to the public.

(d) Subsection (a) does not prevent a governmental body from disclosing an e-mail address for any reason to another governmental body or to a federal agency.

Act of June 2, 2003, 78<sup>th</sup> Leg., R.S., H.B. 2032, § 1 (to be codified as amendment to Gov't Code § 552.137). Section 552.137 requires a governmental body to withhold certain e-mail addresses of members of the public that are provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with the governmental body, unless the members of the public with whom the e-mail addresses are associated have affirmatively consented to their release. Section 552.137 does not apply to a government employee's work e-mail address or a business's general e-mail address or web address. E-mail addresses that are encompassed by subsection 552.137(c) are also not excepted from disclosure under section 552.137. Based on our review of the submitted information, we find that the e-mail addresses that we have marked are excepted from disclosure under section 552.137(a). You do not inform us that a member of the public has affirmatively consented to the release of any e-mail address contained in the submitted materials. Accordingly, we conclude that the town must withhold the e-mail addresses that we have marked pursuant to section 552.137(a) of the Government Code.

In summary, the information that we have marked may be withheld under section 552.107. For those employees who timely elected to keep their personal information confidential, the town must withhold the information that we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1). The town may not withhold this information under section 552.117(a)(1) for those employees

who did not make a timely election to keep the information confidential. The e-mail addresses that we have marked must be withheld from disclosure pursuant to section 552.137(a). The remaining submitted information must be released to the requestor.

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, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, 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).

Ms. Meredith Ladd - Page 7

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 Texas Building and Procurement Commission 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. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. 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,



Cindy Nettles  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CN/jh

Ref: ID# 188467

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Cory Spiker  
6009 Pine Valley Drive  
Flower Mound, Texas 75022  
(w/o enclosures)