



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 15, 2022

Ms. Rachel Saucier  
Executive Assistant  
City Georgetown  
P.O. Box 409  
Georgetown, Texas 78627-0409

OR2022-24247

Dear Ms. Saucier:

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# 963002 (ORR G017644).

The City of Georgetown (the "city") received a request for communications pertaining to the Woodside Planned Unit Development. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> Additionally, the city states release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of third parties. Accordingly, the city states, and provides documentation showing, it notified McKim & Creed and SEC Planning, LLC of the request for information and of the right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in the Act in certain circumstances). We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

---

<sup>1</sup> We note, in a letter dated July 20, 2022, we asked the city to provide additional information pursuant to section 552.303 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.303(c)-(d) (if attorney general determines that information in addition to that required by section 552.301 is necessary to render decision, written notice of that fact shall be given to governmental body and requestor, and governmental body shall submit necessary additional information to attorney general not later than seventh calendar day after date of receipt of notice). As of the date of this letter, this office has not received a response to our correspondence.

Initially, we note the requestor states in his request, “[t]his is a continuing request for information as it becomes available.” It is implicit in several provisions of the Act that the Act applies only to information already in existence. *See* Gov’t Code §§ 552.002, .021, .227, .351. The Act does not require a governmental body to prepare new information in response to a request. *See* Attorney General Opinion H-90 (1973); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 572 at 1 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990), 452 at 2-3 (1986), 87 (1975). Consequently, a governmental body is not required to comply with a standing request to supply information prepared in the future. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-48 at 2 (1983); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 476 at 1 (1987), 465 at 1 (1987). Thus, the only information encompassed by the present request consists of information the city maintained or had a right of access to as of the date it received the request.

We note an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body’s notice under section 552.305(d) to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received comments from any of the third parties at issue explaining why their information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude any of the third parties have a protected proprietary interest in the submitted information. *See, e.g., id.* § 552.110 (requiring the provision of specific factual evidence demonstrating the applicability of the exception). Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the information at issue on the basis of any proprietary interest the third parties at issue may have in it.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information subject to the attorney-client privilege. *See id.* § 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. 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 “to facilitate 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). 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: (A) to whom disclosure is made to further the rendition of professional legal services to the client; or (B) reasonably necessary to transmit 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, orig. proceeding). 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 submitted information constitutes communications between city attorneys and city employees that were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the city. You also state the communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find the city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. However, we find the remaining information at issue was shared with parties you have not shown to be privileged. Thus, we conclude you have failed to establish the remaining information constitutes privileged communications for the purposes of section 552.107(1), and the city may not withhold it on that basis.

We note some of the materials at issue 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. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; *see* Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). 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.

In summary, the city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information; however, any information subject to copyright may only be released in accordance with copyright law.

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,

Jennifer Copeland  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JC/mo

Ref: ID# 963002

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Third Parties  
(w/o enclosures)