



OFFICE *of the* ATTORNEY GENERAL
GREG ABBOTT

April 22, 2003

Ms. Tamara Pitts
Assistant City Attorney
City of Fort Worth
1000 Throckmorton Street
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

OR2003-2676

Dear Ms. Pitts:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 179807.

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received a request for the following information:

[A]ny and all communications, written, electronic or otherwise, occurring between the City of Fort Worth, Prime Strategies and any other individuals, organizations or entities concerning:

1. The intersection of Bellaire Drive and the proposed SH 121, including but not limited to construction of an interchange, traffic studies, right of way acquisition, costs analysis, or intersection configuration, and
2. Any land use or zoning issues concerning the adjacent land parcels, including but not limited to induced land use or proposed changes in the land use

occurring during the period from January 1, 2002 to the present, as well as all future communication on this subject.

You state that some responsive information has been released to the requestor. You claim that a portion of the remaining requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.105, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

This office has previously ruled that a governmental body need not honor a standing request. A "standing request" refers to a request to provide information "on a periodic basis," *see* Open Records Decision No. 465 (1987); a weekly basis, *see* Open Records Decision No. 476 (1987); or to provide information that has not yet been recorded, *see* Open Records Decision No. 452 (1986) (document not within chapter 552's purview if it does not exist when governmental body receives request for it). Further, a governmental body is not required to prepare new information to respond to a request for information. *A&T Consultants, Inc. v. Sharp*, 904 S.W.2d 668, 676 (Tex.1995); *Fish v. Dallas Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 31 S.W.3d 678, 681(Tex. App.–Eastland, pet. denied); Attorney General Opinion H-90 (1973); Open Records Decision Nos. 452 at 2-3, 342 at 3 (1982), 87 (1975). Nor does the Public Information Act require a governmental body to inform a requestor if the requested information comes into existence after the request is made. Open Records Decision No. 452 at 8. Consequently, a governmental body is not required to comply with a continuing request to supply information on a periodic basis as such information is prepared in the future. Attorney General Opinion JM-48 at 2 (1983); Open Records Decision Nos. 476 at 1, 465 at 1 (1987). A portion of this request is a standing request, as it seeks "all future communication on this subject." Therefore, the city is not obliged to comply with the portion of the request to provide information on a periodic basis.¹

Initially, we note that the submitted information includes a copy of a city council resolution. In Open Records Decision No. 551 (1990), this office addressed whether a city ordinance could be withheld from the public under the Public Information Act and stated that:

It is difficult to conceive of a more open record. The law, binding upon every citizen, is free for publication to all. *Banks v. Manchester*, 128 U.S. 244, 253 (1888). This policy is based on the concept of due process which requires that the people have notice of the law. *Building Officials & Code Admin. v. Code Technology, Inc.*, 628 F.2d 730, 734 (1st Cir. 1980). Given this constitutional consideration, it is difficult to hypothesize a circumstance that would bring a law or ordinance within an exception to public disclosure.

¹*Cf.* Open Records Decision No. 561 at 8 (1990) (governmental body has duty to make good faith effort to relate request for information to information governmental body holds).

We believe that the submitted city council resolution is analogous to an ordinance. Accordingly, the city must release to the requestor the city council resolution we have marked in the submitted information.

We next note that a portion of the submitted materials includes information made public by section 552.022 of the Government Code. This section provides several categories of information that are not excepted from required disclosure unless they "are expressly confidential under other law." In pertinent part this section reads

(a) Without limiting the amount or kind of information that is public information under this chapter, 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:

(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[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(5). The information that we have marked constitutes working papers used to estimate the need for or expenditure of public funds by the city. Thus, this information must be released to the requestor under section 552.022(a)(5), unless it is confidential under other law.

Sections 552.103, 552.105, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code are discretionary exceptions to disclosure that protect a governmental body's interests and are therefore not other law that makes information expressly confidential for purposes of section 552.022(a). *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); Open Records Decision Nos. 663 (1999) (governmental body may waive sections 552.103 and 552.111), 630 at 4-5 (1994) (governmental body may waive statutory predecessor to section 552.107), 522 at 4 (1989) (discretionary exceptions in general), 473 (1987) (governmental body may waive predecessor to section 552.111). The information that is subject to the purview of section 552.022 may therefore not be withheld on the basis of any of those exceptions.

However, the attorney-client privilege and work product privilege are also found in Rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence and Rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure,

respectively. Recently, the Texas Supreme Court held that "[t]he Texas Rules of Civil Procedure and Texas Rules of Evidence are other law within the meaning of section 552.022." *In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328 (Tex. 2001). This office has determined that when the attorney-client privilege or work-product privilege is claimed for information that is subject to release under section 552.022, the proper analysis is whether the information at issue is excepted under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 (attorney-client communications) or Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5 (work product). Open Records Decision Nos. 677 at 8-9 (2002), 676 at 5-6 (2002). As you claim that the information at issue in Exhibit C is privileged, we will therefore consider whether the information is excepted under these rules.

Rule 503(b)(1) provides:

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.

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. Tex. R. Evid. 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 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 Open Records Decision No. 676 (2002). 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, no pet.) (privilege attaches to complete communication, including factual information).

Upon reviewing your arguments and the submitted records, we conclude that you have demonstrated that some of the information constitutes confidential communications made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the client. We have marked the submitted information in Exhibit C that the city may withhold under Rule 503.

You also contend that information contained in Exhibit C is protected by the attorney work product privilege, which is also found in Rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. An attorney's core work product is confidential under Rule 192.5. Core work product is defined as the work product of an attorney or an attorney's representative developed in anticipation of litigation or for trial that contains the attorney's or the attorney's representative's mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories. 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 an attorney's or the attorney's representative's mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories. *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 *National 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 prong of the work product test requires the governmental body to show that the documents at issue contains the attorney’s or the attorney’s representative’s mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories. Tex. R. Civ. P. 192.5(b)(1). A document containing core work product information that meets both prongs of the work product test is confidential under Rule 192.5 provided the information does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in Rule 192.5(c). *Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.–Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, no writ). In this instance, after careful review, we conclude that you have failed to demonstrate that the information in Exhibit C that is subject to section 552.022 is core work product protected under Rule 192.5. Thus, the city may not withhold any of the information subject to section 552.022(a) under that provision.

We next address your claimed exceptions for the submitted information that is not subject to section 552.022. You argue that the remaining submitted information in Exhibit C is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code, which provides 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 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.

The city 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, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *University of Tex. Law Sch. v. Texas 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). The city must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under 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). 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.² Open Records 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 state that an aggrieved party has threatened to file suit and has hired a litigation attorney. You further state that the city is presently seeking outside litigators to represent the city in this matter. After reviewing your arguments and the submitted documents, we conclude that litigation is reasonably anticipated in this instance. We also find that the submitted information is related to the anticipated litigation for the purposes of section 552.103(a).

²In 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 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).

Accordingly, we conclude that the city may withhold the remaining submitted information in Exhibit C pursuant to section 552.103 of the Government Code.³

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. 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(a), and it must be disclosed. Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

You next assert that the remaining submitted information in Exhibit D is excepted from public disclosure under section 552.105 of the Government Code. Section 552.105 excepts from disclosure information relating to:

- (1) the location of real or personal property for a public purpose prior to public announcement of the project; or
- (2) appraisals or purchase price of real or personal property for a public purpose prior to the formal award of contracts for the property.

Section 552.105 was designed to protect a governmental body's planning and negotiating position with respect to particular transactions. Open Records Decision No. 564 at 2 (1990). This exception protects information relating to the location, appraisals, and purchase price of property only until the transaction is either completed or aborted. Open Records Decision Nos. 357 at 3 (1982), 310 at 2 (1982). In this instance, you inform us that the submitted information pertains to active right-of-way acquisition negotiations between the city and private landowners. You further inform us that there has been no public announcement of the location or possible purchase price of the real property discussed in the submitted documents. Finally, you contend that release of the submitted information would damage the city's position in negotiations to acquire the right-of-way. Based on your representations, we agree that section 552.105 is applicable to the remaining submitted information in Exhibit D, and that the city may withhold the information that we have marked under that provision.

³As our ruling is dispositive as to the information in Exhibit C, we do not address your remaining arguments regarding this information.

Finally, you claim that the remaining submitted information in Exhibit E is excepted from disclosure under section 552.111 of the Government Code. Section 552.111 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.” In Open Records Decision No. 615 (1993), this office reexamined the predecessor to the section 552.111 exception in light of the decision in *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408 (Tex. App.--Austin 1992, no writ), and held that section 552.111 excepts only those internal communications consisting of advice, recommendations, opinions, and other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the governmental body. *City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351, 364 (Tex. 2000); *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Texas Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.--Austin 2001, no pet.). An agency’s policymaking functions do not encompass internal administrative or personnel matters; disclosure of information relating to such matters will not inhibit free discussion among agency personnel as to policy issues. ORD 615 at 5-6. Additionally, section 552.111 does not generally except from disclosure purely factual information that is severable from the opinion portions of internal memoranda. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 37 S.W.3d at 160; ORD 615 at 4-5. Section 552.111 can encompass communications between a governmental body and a third party acting as a consultant. See Open Records Decision Nos. 631 at 2 (1995) (section 552.111 encompasses information created for governmental body by outside consultant acting at governmental body’s request and performing task that is within governmental body’s authority), 563 at 5-6 (1990) (private entity engaged in joint project with governmental body may be regarded as its consultant), 561 at 9 (1990) (predecessor to section 552.111 encompasses communications with party with which governmental body has privity of interest or common deliberative process), 462 at 14 (1987) (section 552.111 applies to memoranda prepared by governmental body’s consultants).

You state that the remaining submitted information in Exhibit E was created by outside consultants acting on behalf of the city. You further advise that the information presented by the consultants was used “during deliberations regarding policy decisions as it pertained to the financing, developing, operating and construction of the SH121.” Based upon your representations and our review of the information at issue, we find that the city may withhold the information that we have marked in Exhibit E pursuant to section 552.111. However, some of the information that you wish to withhold under section 552.111 consists of purely factual information that is severable from the opinion portions of the internal memoranda. Furthermore, you have not adequately demonstrated how other portions of the information

that you wish to withhold under section 552.111 relate to policymaking matters of the city. Therefore, you may not withhold this information under section 552.111.

Finally, we note that the submitted information also contains e-mail addresses obtained from the public. Section 552.137 makes certain e-mail addresses confidential. Section 552.137 provides:

(a) 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.

Gov't Code §552.137. 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. The city must, therefore, withhold e-mail addresses of members of the public under section 552.137.

In summary, we have marked the information that the city may withhold: in Exhibit C, under Rule 503 and section 552.103; in Exhibit D, under section 552.105; and in Exhibit E, pursuant to section 552.111. The city must withhold e-mail addresses of members of the public under section 552.137. 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 Department of Public 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 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

Ms. Tamara Pitts - Page 12

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# 179807

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Charles E. Blanton
Overton Woods SH 121 Task Force
3600 Briarhaven Road
Fort Worth, Texas 76109
(w/o enclosures)