



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

October 10, 2006

Ms. Rebecca H. Brewer  
Abernathy, Roeder, Boyd & Joplin, P.C.  
P.O. Box 1210  
McKinney, Texas 75070-1210

OR2006-11800

Dear Ms. Brewer:

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# 261628.

The City of Frisco (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to "allegations by [Life Time Fitness] relating to [the city's] recreation/aquatic center." You state that some of the requested information will be released, but claim that the remainder of the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.103 of the Government Code, as well as rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence and rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that you have submitted some information that was created after the request was received. This information, which we have marked, is thus not responsive to the request for information. This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the request, and the city is not required to release that information in response to the request.

Next, we note that the submitted information contains two resolutions adopted by the city council. Because laws and ordinances are binding on members of the public, they are matters of public record and may not be withheld from disclosure under the Act. *See* Open Records Decision No. 221 at 1 (1979) ("official records of the public proceedings of a governmental body are among the most open of records"); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 551 at 2-3 (1990) (laws or ordinances are open records). The submitted resolutions are analogous to ordinances. Accordingly, the city must release the submitted resolutions.

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

the following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure under this chapter unless they are expressly confidential under other law:

- (3) information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of public or other funds by a governmental body[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(3). The submitted information includes a city contract, which is subject to subsection 552.022(a)(3). The city must release this contract, which we have marked, unless it is expressly confidential under other law. You claim that this contract is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code, as well as rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence and rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. We note that section 552.103 is a discretionary exception that protects the governmental body's interests and may be waived. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); Open Records Decision Nos. 542 at 4 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.103 may be waived). As such, the city may not withhold the submitted contract under section 552.103. However, the Texas Supreme Court has held that the Texas Rules of Evidence and Texas Rules of Civil Procedure are "other law" within the meaning of section 552.022. *In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). We will therefore consider your arguments under rule 503 and rule 192.5 for the contract subject to section 552.022.

Rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence enacts the attorney-client privilege and provides in part:

A client has a privilege to refuse to disclose and to prevent any other person from disclosing confidential communications made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the client:

- (A) between the client or a representative of the client and the client's lawyer or a representative of the lawyer;
- (B) between the lawyer and the lawyer's representative;
- (C) by the client or a representative of the client, or the client's lawyer or a representative of the lawyer, to a lawyer or a representative of a lawyer representing another party in a pending action and concerning a matter of common interest therein;
- (D) between representatives of the client or between the client and a representative of the client; or

(E) among lawyers and their representatives representing the same client.

TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). A communication is “confidential” if 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). Thus, in order to withhold attorney-client privileged information from disclosure under rule 503, a governmental body must: (1) show that the document is a communication transmitted between privileged parties or reveals a confidential communication; (2) identify the parties involved in the communication; and (3) show that the communication is confidential by explaining that it was not intended to be disclosed to third persons and that it was made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client. Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the information is privileged and confidential under rule 503, provided the client has not waived the privilege or the document does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in rule 503(d). *See Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, no writ). In this instance, although you assert the attorney-client privilege for the submitted contract, we find that the contract is not a privileged communication and it may not be withheld under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.

Next, you claim that the submitted contract is protected under rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. Rule 192.5 encompasses the attorney work product privilege. For purposes of section 552.022 of the Government Code, information is confidential under rule 192.5 only to the extent that the information implicates the core work product aspect of the work product privilege. *See Open Records Decision No. 677 at 9-10 (2002)*. Rule 192.5 defines core work product as the work product of an attorney or an attorney’s representative, developed in anticipation of litigation or for trial, that contains the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of the attorney or the attorney’s representative. *See TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5(a), (b)(1)*. Accordingly, in order to withhold attorney core work product from disclosure under rule 192.5, a governmental body must demonstrate that the material was (1) created for trial or in anticipation of litigation and (2) consists of the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of an attorney or an attorney’s representative. *Id.*

The first prong of the work product test, which requires a governmental body to show that the information at issue was created in anticipation of litigation, has two parts. A governmental body must demonstrate that (1) 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 (2) the party resisting discovery believed in good faith that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue and conducted the investigation for the purpose of preparing for such litigation. *See Nat’l Tank 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. The second part of the work product test

requires the governmental body to show that the materials at issue contain the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of an attorney's or an attorney's representative. *See* TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5(b)(1). A document containing core work product information that meets both parts of the work product test is confidential under rule 192.5, provided that the information does not fall within the scope of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in rule 192.5(c). *See Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, no writ).

You assert that the submitted contract is core attorney work product. However, we have reviewed the contract and find that it was not created in anticipation of litigation. Therefore, this information may not be withheld under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5. Rather, the submitted contract must be released pursuant to section 552.022 of the Government Code.

Next, we address your arguments as to the remaining information. Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information deemed confidential by law. Section 551.104(c) of the Government Code provides that “[t]he certified agenda or tape of a closed meeting is available for public inspection and copying *only under a court order issued under Subsection (b)(3).*” (Emphasis added.) Thus, such information cannot be released to a member of the public in response to an open records request.<sup>1</sup> *See* Open Records Decision No. 495 (1988). Accordingly, the city must withhold any responsive certified agenda or tape recording of a closed meeting of the city council under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 551.104(c) of the Government Code.

Next, you assert that the remainder of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code, which provides in relevant part as follows:

(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 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

---

<sup>1</sup>As you acknowledge, the city is not required to submit the certified agenda or tape recording of a closed meeting to this office for review. *See* Open Records Decision No. 495 at 4 (attorney general lacks authority to review certified agendas or tapes of executive sessions to determine whether a governmental body may withhold such information from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.101 of the Government Code).

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 is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that: (1) litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the request for information is received; and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, no pet.); *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). A government body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a).

To establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office "concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture." Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be "realistically contemplated"). On the other hand, this office has determined that, 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). Further, the fact that a potential opposing party has hired an attorney who makes a request for information does not establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).

You inform us that the remaining information relates to the construction and design of the city's recreation/aquatic center. You state that prior to the city's receipt of the current request, the city received a letter from an attorney for Life Time Fitness, Inc. stating that the design of the recreation/aquatic center infringed on his client's intellectual property rights. You also state that the attorney threatened legal action against the city if the design of the recreation/aquatic center was not sufficiently altered. Based on your representations and our review, we conclude that litigation was reasonably anticipated by the city on the date it received the request for information. We also find that the remaining information is related to the anticipated litigation.

Generally, however, once information has been obtained by all parties to the litigation through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103 interest exists with respect to that information. Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to the opposing party in the anticipated litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103. We also note that the applicability of section 552.103 ends once the litigation has been concluded. We have marked the information that may be withheld under section 552.103. We note, however, that the

remaining information has been provided by or to the opposing counsel in the anticipated litigation; this information may therefore not be withheld under section 552.103. We will address your remaining arguments against the disclosure of this information.

You assert that the remaining information is protected under the attorney-client privilege. We will address your claim under section 552.107 of the Government Code, which also 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 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 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*, 922 S.W.2d at 923.

You assert that the remaining information constitutes confidential communications between city employees and the city’s counsel. As noted above, however, we find that the remaining information consists of communications between the city’s counsel and counsel for the opposing party. Therefore, this information is not protected under the attorney-client privilege, and it may not be withheld under section 552.107.

You also assert that the remaining information is protected under the work product privilege. We will address your claim under section 552.111 of the Government Code, which excepts

from disclosure “an interagency or intra-agency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency.” This section also encompasses the attorney work product privilege found in Rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. *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.

Tex. R. Civ. P. 192.5(a). 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.

*Brotherton*, 851 S.W.2d at 207. 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.

You state that the remaining information was created in anticipation of litigation and contains the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, and legal theories of the city’s counsel. After our review however, we find that the remaining information does not contain the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of the city’s counsel. Therefore, this information is not protected under the work product privilege, and it may not be withheld under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Next, we note that the remaining information includes e-mail addresses. Section 552.137 of the Government Code provides as follows:

(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;

(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.

Gov't Code § 552.137. Section 552.137 excepts certain e-mail addresses of members of the public that are not within the scope of section 552.137(c), unless the relevant members of the public have affirmatively consented to the release of the e-mail addresses. This section does not protect the work e-mail addresses of the employees of an entity with which a governmental body city has a contractual relationship. We have marked the e-mail addresses that the city must withhold in accordance with section 552.137 of the Government Code unless the city receives consent for their release.

We also note that some of the remaining information may be protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.* If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright

law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit. *See* Open Records Decision No. 550 (1990).

In summary, the non-responsive information need not be released. The contract and city council resolutions, which we have marked, must be released to the requestor. The city must withhold any responsive certified agenda or tape recording of a closed meeting of the city council under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 551.104(c) of the Government Code. The city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.103 of the Government Code. The e-mail addresses we have marked must be withheld under section 552.137 of the Government Code unless the city receives consent for their release. The remaining information must be released. In doing so, however, the information must be released in accordance with applicable copyright laws for any information protected by copyright.

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'JAP', written over a horizontal line.

James A. Person III  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JAP/dh

Ref: ID# 261628

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Douglas Furney  
2075 Remington Lane  
Frisco, Texas 75034  
(w/o enclosures)