



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 12, 2022

Ms. Marie N. Johnson  
Counsel for the township of Denison  
Messer, Fort & McDonald, PLLC  
6371 Preston Road, Suite 200  
Frisco, Texas 75034

OR2022-13721

Dear Ms. Johnson:

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# 941514 (ORR ID: 2021-537).

The Woodlands Township (the "township"), which you represent, received a request for certain information pertaining to the requestor's client from a particular time period.<sup>1</sup> You state the township will release some information to the requestor. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code and privileged under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> We note the township sought and received clarifications of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request). Further, you inform us the township sent the requestor an estimate of charges pursuant to section 552.2615 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.2615. The estimate of charges required the requestor to provide a deposit for payment of anticipated costs under section 552.263 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.263(a). You also inform us the township received the required deposit on February 8, 2022. *See id.* § 552.263(e) (if governmental body requires deposit or bond for anticipated costs pursuant to section 552.263, request for information is considered to have been received on date governmental body receives bond or deposit).

<sup>2</sup> We 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.

Initially, you indicate some of the submitted information is not responsive to the present request. This ruling does not address the public availability of the non-responsive information, and the township need not release it in response to this request.

Next, we note the responsive information contains draft minutes from the township's open meetings. Section 551.022 of the Open Meetings Act, chapter 551 of the Government Code, expressly provides that the "minutes and tape recordings of an open meeting are public records and shall be available for public inspection and copying on request to the governmental body's chief administrative officer or the officer's designee." Gov't Code § 551.022. In this instance, the information at issue includes draft minutes. We note the minutes of a public meeting of a governmental body are public records when entered, are public in whatever form they exist, and public access may not be delayed until formal approval is obtained. Open Records Decision No. 225 (1979). Accordingly, section 551.022 is applicable to the draft minutes. Accordingly, the meeting minutes are public records subject to section 551.022 of the Government Code. The exceptions to disclosure found in the Act, such as sections 552.103 and 552.111, do not apply to information that other statutes make public. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 623 at 3 (1994), 525 at 3 (1989). Accordingly, the township must release the draft minutes pursuant to section 551.022 of the Government Code.

Next, we note some of the responsive information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022 provides in part:

(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:

...

(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;

...

(16) information that is in a bill for attorney's fees and is not privileged under the attorney-client privilege[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(5), (16). The responsive information contains information that is subject to subsection 552.022(a)(5) and attorney fee bills that are subject to section 552.022(a)(16). You seek to withhold portions of the information at issue under sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. However, sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 are discretionary in nature and do not make information confidential under the Act. *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 Gov't Code § 552.103); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 677 (2002) (governmental body may waive attorney work product privilege under section 552.111), 676 at 10-11 (2002)

(attorney-client privilege under Gov't Code § 552.107(1) may be waived), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Therefore, the information at issue may not be withheld under section 552.103, section 552.107, or section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, the Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Evidence are “other law” within the meaning of section 552.022. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). Therefore, we will consider your assertion of the attorney-client privilege under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 for the information subject to 552.022. We will also address your arguments for the responsive information not subject to 552.022.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides, in part:

(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 the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received the request for information, 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, 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). A governmental 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 with “concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture.” *See* 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.<sup>3</sup> Open Records

---

<sup>3</sup>In addition, this office has concluded that litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party took the following objective steps toward litigation: filed a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, *see* Open Records Decision No. 336 (1982); hired an attorney who made a demand

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 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. Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).

You assert portions of the responsive information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code are excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code. Upon review, we find you have not demonstrated any party had taken any concrete steps toward the initiation of litigation against the township on the date the request was received. Consequently, we find you have failed to demonstrate the township reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the present request. Therefore, the township may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

Texas Rule of Evidence 503(b)(1) provides:

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

(A) between the client or the client’s representative and the client’s lawyer or the lawyer’s representative;

(B) between the client’s lawyer and the lawyer’s representative;

(C) by the client, the client’s representative, the client’s lawyer, or the lawyer’s representative to a lawyer representing another party in a pending action or that lawyer’s representative, if the communications concern a matter of common interest in the pending action;

(D) between the client’s representatives or between the client and the client’s representative; 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 to further the rendition of professional legal services to the client or reasonably necessary to transmit the communication. *Id.* 503(a)(5). Accordingly, 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

---

for disputed payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, *see* Open Records Decision No. 346 (1982); and threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney, *see* Open Records Decision No. 288 (1981).

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. *See* ORD 676 at 6-7. Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the entire communication is confidential under rule 503, provided the client has not waived the privilege or the communication does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in rule 503(d). *Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein); *In re Valero Energy Corp.*, 973 S.W.2d 453, 457 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1998, orig. proceeding) (privilege attaches to complete communication, including factual information).

The township asserts the portions of the responsive fee bills it marked should be withheld under rule 503. The township states the submitted fee bills include privileged attorney-client communications between the township's attorneys and township officials and staff in their capacities as clients. The township explains the communications at issue were made for the purpose of the rendition of legal services to the township. The township states the communications at issue have not been, and were not intended to be, disclosed to third parties. Based on these representations and our review of the information at issue, we find the township has established most of the information at issue constitutes privileged attorney-client communications under rule 503. Thus, with the exception of the information we have marked for release, the township may withhold the information it marked within the submitted attorney fee bills pursuant to rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. However, we find the township has failed to demonstrate the information we have marked for release constitutes privileged attorney-client communications for the purposes of rule 503. We note an entry stating a memorandum or e-mail was prepared or drafted does not demonstrate the document was communicated to the client. Thus, we find the township has failed to demonstrate the information we have marked for release consists of privileged attorney client communications. Therefore, the township may not withhold any portion of the remaining information at issue under rule 503.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. The elements of the privilege under section 552.107 are the same as those discussed for Texas Rule of Evidence 503. 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* ORD 676 at 6-7. 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 section 552.107 for portions of the remaining responsive information that are not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. You state the information you marked consists of communications between attorneys for the township and city officials that were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the township. You state the communications were intended to be, and have remained, confidential. Based upon these representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue.

Thus, the township may withhold the remaining responsive information you marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.111 of the Government Code 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, writ ref’d n.r.e.); 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, no writ). We determined section 552.111 excepts from disclosure only those internal communications that consist of advice, recommendations, opinions, and other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the governmental body. *See* ORD 615 at 5. 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. *Id.*; *see also City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351 (Tex. 2000) (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking). 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).

Further, section 552.111 does not protect facts and written observations of facts and events severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.); *see* 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).

This office has also concluded a preliminary draft of a document intended for public release in its final form necessarily represents the drafter’s advice, opinion, and recommendation with regard to the form and content of the final document, so as to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.111. *See* Open Records Decision No. 559 at 2 (1990) (applying statutory predecessor). Section 552.111 protects factual information in the draft that also will be included in the final version of the document. *See id.* at 2-3. Thus, section 552.111 encompasses the entire contents, including comments, underlining, deletions, and proofreading marks, of a preliminary draft of a policymaking document that will be released to the public in its final form. *See id.* at 2.

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 No. 561 at 9 (1990) (section 552.111 encompasses communications with

party with which governmental body has privity of interest or common deliberative process). 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.

You seek to withhold portions of the remaining responsive information under section 552.111 of the Government Code. You state the information you marked consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations of township employees and officials and other parties with whom the township shares a privity of interest or common deliberative process regarding policymaking matters. You further state some of the information you marked consist of draft documents that were released in their final forms. Upon review, we find the township may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, we find the remaining information at issue consists of information that is administrative or purely factual in nature, does not pertain to policymaking, or was shared with a party with whom the township has not demonstrated it shares a privity of interest or common deliberative process. Thus, you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue reveals advice, opinions, or recommendations that pertain to policymaking. Accordingly, the township may not withhold any of the remaining responsive information under section 552.111 of the Government Code on the basis of the deliberative process privilege.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate the information you marked is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public concern. Therefore, the township may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

We note some of the remaining information may be subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code.<sup>4</sup> Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the current and former home addresses and telephone numbers, emergency contact information, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former employees of a governmental body who request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. Gov’t Code § 552.117(a)(1).

---

<sup>4</sup> The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision No. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

Section 552.117(a)(1) also applies to the personal cellular telephone number of a current or former official or employee of a governmental body, provided the cellular telephone service is not paid by a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-6 (1988). 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, a governmental body must withhold information under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee only if the individual made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for this information was made. Therefore, if the employee whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code and the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body, the township must withhold the cellular telephone number we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. Conversely, if the employee at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024 or the cellular telephone service is paid for by a governmental body, the township may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.117(a)(1).

Section 552.137 of the Government Code 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). Gov’t Code § 552.137(a)-(c). Section 552.137 is not applicable to an institutional e-mail address, an Internet website 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, or an e-mail address maintained by a governmental entity for one of its officials or employees. *See id.* § 552.137(c). Accordingly, to the extent the e-mail addresses in the remaining responsive information are not excluded by subsection 552.137(c) of the Government Code, the township must withhold the e-mail addresses in the remaining information under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the individuals to whom the e-mail addresses belong affirmatively consent to their release. *See id.* § 552.137(b). However, to the extent the e-mail addresses at issue are excluded by subsection 552.137(c), the township may not withhold the e-mail addresses at issue under section 552.137 of the Government Code.

In summary, the township must release the draft minutes pursuant to section 551.022 of the Government Code. With the exception of the information we have marked for release, the township may withhold the information it marked within the submitted attorney fee bills pursuant to rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. The township may withhold the remaining responsive information you marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The township may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. If the employee whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code and the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body, the township must withhold the cellular telephone number we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. To the extent the e-mail addresses in the remaining responsive information are not excluded by subsection 552.137(c) of the Government Code, the township must withhold the e-mail addresses in the remaining information under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the individuals to whom the e-mail addresses belong affirmatively consent to their release. The township must release the remaining information.

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 <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open-government/members-public/what-expect-after-ruling-issued> or call the OAG's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Public Information Act may be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the OAG, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

Erin Groff  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

EMG/be

Ref: ID# 941514

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)