



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 12, 2022

Ms. Karen Stack
Legal & Legislative Services Manager
City of Brenham
P.O. Box 1059
Brenham, Texas 77834-1059

OR2022-31255

Dear Ms. Stack:

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# 975108.

The City of Brenham (the "city") received a request for twenty-nine categories of information during a stated period of time, including certain communications, specified types of contracts, and certain information pertaining to the city's airport. You state the city has released some information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.107 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

Initially, we note the submitted information contains a copy of a city resolution. As laws and ordinances are binding on members of the public, they are matters of public record and

¹ We note in a letter dated September 28, 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). In response, the city informed us it would not submit additional comments.

² We assume 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 those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

may not be withheld from disclosure under the Act. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 551 at 2-3 (1990) (laws or ordinances are open records), 221 at 1 (1979) (official records of governmental body's public proceedings are among most open of records). The submitted resolution is analogous to an ordinance. Accordingly, the city must release the submitted city resolution.

Next, we note the remaining information contains meeting minutes and agendas of public meetings conducted by the city. The minutes and agendas of a governmental body's public meetings are specifically made public under provisions of the Open Meetings Act (the "OMA"), chapter 551 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code §§ 551.022 (minutes and tape recordings of open meeting are public records and shall be available for public inspection and copying on request to governmental body's chief administrative officer or officer's designee), .041 (governmental body shall give written notice of date, hour, place, and subject of each meeting), .043 (notice of meeting of governmental body must be posted in place readily accessible to general public for at least 72 hours before scheduled time of meeting). We note the minutes and agenda 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). Although you seek to withhold this information under sections 552.103 and 552.107 of the Government Code, the exceptions to disclosure found in the Act 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 city must release the submitted public meeting agendas and minutes pursuant to sections 551.022 and 551.041 of the Government Code.

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

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

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

...

(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)(1), (3). The remaining information includes a completed report subject to section 552.022(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city must release this information, which we have marked, pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1) unless it is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or expressly made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* § 552.022(a)(1). The information at issue

also contains information in an account, contract, or voucher relating to the receipt or expenditure of funds by the city that is subject to section 552.022(a)(3) of the Government Code. This information, which we have marked, must be released pursuant to section 552.022(a)(3) unless it is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* § 552.022(a)(3). Although you raise section 552.103 of the Government Code for the information subject to section 552.022, this section is a discretionary exception to disclosure and does 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); Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Therefore, none of the information subject to section 552.022, which we have marked, may be withheld under section 552.103. Additionally, although you raise section 552.107 of the Government Code for some of the information subject to section 552.022, this section is also a discretionary exception that does not make information confidential under the Act. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 10-11 (2002) (attorney-client privilege under Gov't Code § 552.107(1) may be waived), 665 at 2 n.5, 663 at 5.* 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). Accordingly, we will address your attorney-client privilege claim under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence for the information at issue. Additionally, because section 552.136 of the Government Code makes information confidential under the Act, we will consider its applicability to the information subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code.³ We will also address your arguments under sections 552.103 and 552.107 of the Government Code for the information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code.

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

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;

³ The 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).*

(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 it is 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 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 the communication is confidential by explaining it was not intended to be disclosed to third persons and it was made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client. *See* ORD 676. 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 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).

You assert some of the information subject to section 552.022(a)(3) of the Government Code consists of privileged attorney-client communications. You state the information at issue consists of attachments to communications between outside counsel for the city and city staff in their capacities as clients that were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the city. Further, you state the communications to which the information at issue was attached were intended to be, and have remained, confidential. Based upon your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Accordingly, the city may withhold the information we have marked under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides, in relevant 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). The governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show section 552.103(a) is applicable 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 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). The governmental body must meet both parts of this test for information to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a). *See* ORD 551 at 4.

To establish 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). Concrete evidence to support a claim that litigation is reasonably anticipated may include, for example, the governmental body’s receipt of a letter, prior to its receipt of a request for information, 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”). In Open Records Decision No. 638 (1996), this office stated a governmental body has met its burden of showing that litigation is reasonably anticipated when it received a notice of claim letter and the governmental body represents that the notice of claim letter is in compliance with the requirements of the Texas Tort Claims Act (“TTCA”), Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code, ch. 101. If a governmental body does not make this representation, the claim letter is a factor that this office will consider in determining whether a governmental body has established litigation is reasonably anticipated based on the totality of the circumstances. 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. 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). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. ORD 452 at 4.

You assert the city anticipated litigation upon receipt of the present request for information. You state, and provide documentation demonstrating, prior to the city’s receipt of the present request, the city received multiple communications from the requestor’s law firm on behalf of his clients in which the requestor alleged the city defaulted on its contract with the clients and discriminated against the clients. You also state the requestor threatened

litigation against the city. You do not affirmatively represent to this office the notice of claim meets the requirements of the TTCA; therefore, we will only consider the notice of claim as a factor in determining whether the city reasonably anticipated litigation pertaining to the incident specified in the requests. Nevertheless, based upon our review of the information at issue and the totality of the circumstances, we find the city reasonably anticipated litigation on the date it received the present request. Additionally, you state the information at issue pertains to the subject matter of the anticipated litigation. Accordingly, with the exception of the information subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code, the city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.⁴

Generally, however, once information has been obtained by all parties to the litigation through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to all parties to the anticipated litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a) and must be disclosed. Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded. *See* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

Section 552.136(b) of the Government Code provides, “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a government body is confidential.” Gov’t Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). Accordingly, the city must withhold all bank account and routing numbers within the remaining information under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must release the submitted city resolution. The city must release the submitted public meeting agendas and minutes pursuant to sections 551.022 and 551.041 of the Government Code. With the exception of the information subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code, the city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.103 of the Government Code. The city must withhold all bank account and routing numbers within the information subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The city must release the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.022 of the Government Code.

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->

⁴ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

[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,

Blake Brennan
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

BBX/eb

Ref: ID# 975108

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)