



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

May 10, 2006

Ms. Ellen B. Huchital
McGinnis, Lochridge & Kilgore, L.L.P.
3200 One Houston Center
1221 McKinney Street
Houston, Texas 77010

OR2006-04849

Dear Ms. Huchital:

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# 247390.

The Eanes Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received seven requests for certain categories of information held by district board members related to board meetings, training materials, operating procedures, complaints, budget information, and other information concerning official board business. The requestor has specifically excluded social security numbers and information that is confidential pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974, section 1232g of title 20 of the United States Code, from her request. Accordingly, any of this information within the requested documents is not responsive to the present request. This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the present request, and the district need not release that information in response to this request. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed). You indicate that some of the requested information has been released in response to prior requests for information from this requestor. *See Gov't Code § 552.232* (prescribing procedures for response to repetitious or redundant requests for information). You claim that the remaining requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.103, 552.105, 552.107, 552.111, 552.117, and 552.137 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted

representative sample of information.¹ We have also considered comments submitted by the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Initially, we note that some of the submitted information appears to have been obtained pursuant to a grand jury subpoena. The judiciary is expressly excluded from the requirements of the Act. *See* Gov't Code § 552.003(1)(B). This office has determined that a grand jury, for purposes of the Act, is a part of the judiciary and therefore not subject to the Act. *See* Open Records Decision No. 411 (1984). Further, records kept by another person or entity acting as an agent for a grand jury are considered to be records in the constructive possession of the grand jury and therefore are not subject to the Act. *See* Open Records Decisions Nos. 513 (1988), 411 (1984), 398 (1983); *but see* Open Records Decision No. 513 at 4 (1988) (defining limits of judiciary exclusion). The fact that information collected or prepared by another person or entity is submitted to the grand jury does not necessarily mean that such information is in the grand jury's constructive possession when the same information is also held in the other person's or entity's own capacity. Information held by another person or entity but not produced at the direction of the grand jury may well be protected under one of the Act's specific exceptions to disclosure, but such information is not excluded from the reach of the Act by the judiciary exclusion. *See* Open Records Decision No. 513 (1988). Therefore, to the extent that the information at issue is held by the district as an agent of the grand jury, such information is in the grand jury's constructive possession and is not subject to disclosure under the Act. The rest of this decision is not applicable to such information. To the extent that the information at issue is not held by the district as an agent of the grand jury, so as to be subject to the Act, we consider it with the remaining submitted information.

Next, we note that the submitted documents includes public notices of public hearings to be held during a meeting of the board. The submitted documents also contain agendas of meetings of the board. The notices and agendas of a governmental body's public meetings are specifically made public under the Open Meetings Act, 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 upon request), 551.043 (notice of meeting of governmental body must be posted in a place readily accessible to general public at least 72 hours before scheduled time of meeting), 551.053-.054 (district governing bodies required to post notice of meeting at a place convenient to the public in administrative office of district). Accordingly, the notices and agendas of the public meetings, which we have marked, must be released in accordance with the Open Meetings Act.

¹ 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.

We note that a portion of the remaining submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. This section provides that

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:

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

...

(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)(1), (5). The submitted information contains a completed report made of, for, or by the district. This information is made public by section 552.022(a)(1). The submitted information also contains budgetary information pertaining to the district that was used to estimate the need for or expenditure of public funds. This information must be released unless it is expressly confidential under other law. Although you claim this information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.111 of the Government Code, these are discretionary exceptions that protect a governmental body's interests and may be waived. *Id.* § 552.007; *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. 473 (1987) (governmental body may waive section 552.111), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). As such, sections 552.103 and 552.111 are not other laws that make information confidential for the purposes of section 552.022. Therefore, the district must release the completed report and budgetary information, which we have marked, pursuant to section 552.022.

We now address your arguments under section 552.103 of the Government Code. This section 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 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 district 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. *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). The district 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 state that, prior to the district's receipt of the request for information, the requestor filed complaints against the district with at least four different state and federal agencies, as well as several internal grievances. Based on your assertion, we conclude that litigation was reasonably anticipated by the district on the date it received the request for information. However, after review of your arguments and the information at issue, we conclude you have not established that the information at issue is related to the anticipated litigation. Therefore, the district may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.103.

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.

Gov't Code § 552.105. 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). A governmental body may withhold information "which, if released, would impair or tend to impair [its] 'planning and negotiating position in regard to particular transactions.'" See ORD 357 at 3 (quoting Open Records Decision No. 222 (1979)). The question of whether specific information, if publicly released, would impair a governmental body's planning and negotiation position in regard to particular transactions is a question of fact. Accordingly, this office will accept a governmental body's good faith determination in this regard, unless the contrary is clearly shown as a matter of law. See Open Records Decision No. 564 (1990).

You state that the documents you have marked relate to the district's planning and negotiation position regarding the identified real property. You inform us that there has been no public announcement regarding the district's eventual plans for the property and indicate that the acquisition of the property has not been finalized. You argue that disclosure of the marked information could effect the district's potential future plans for the property at issue. Therefore, we find that the district may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.105.

The district asserts that some of the submitted information is excepted under section 552.107 of the Government Code. Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code 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 v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein). Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, the information you have marked under section 552.107 consists of privileged attorney-client communications that the district may withhold.

Section 552.111 of the Government Code 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.” 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, no writ); *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 that 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 Open Records Decision No. 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 that are severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *See Open Records Decision No. 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 that a preliminary draft of a document that is 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.

After review of your arguments and the submitted information, we conclude that some of the remaining submitted information consists of advice, recommendations, opinions, and other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the district. Therefore, the district may withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.111. However, the district has failed to demonstrate that the remainder of the submitted information consists of intraagency communications consisting of advice, opinion, or recommendations on a district policymaking matter. Consequently, none of the remaining information may be withheld on this basis.

Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This section encompasses information made confidential by other statutes. Section 21.355 of the Education Code, which provides that "[a] document evaluating the performance of a teacher or administrator is confidential." This office has interpreted section 21.355 to apply to any document that evaluates, as that term is commonly understood, the performance of a teacher. *See* Open Records Decision No. 643 (1996). In Open Records Decision No. 643, we determined that the word "teacher" for purposes of section 21.355 means a person who (1) is required to and does in fact hold a teaching certificate under subchapter B of chapter 21 of the Education Code or a school district teaching permit under section 21.055 and (2) is engaged in the process of teaching, as that term is commonly defined, at the time of the evaluation. *See id.* at 4. We also concluded that the word "administrator" in section 21.355 means a person who is required to and does in fact hold an administrator's certificate under subchapter B of chapter 21 of the Education Code and is performing the functions of an administrator, as that term is commonly defined, at the time of the evaluation. *Id.* We understand you to indicate the named employees were teachers and administrators for purposes of section 21.355 at the time the submitted documents were created.

Based on your arguments and our review of the information at issue, we find that a portion of the submitted information constitutes evaluations of a certified teacher and administrator of the district. Accordingly, we conclude that the district must withhold these completed evaluations, which we have marked, pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code

in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education Code. However, the remainder of the information you claim are evaluations do not consist of the types of records made confidential by section 21.355. You argue that the Commissioner of Education has ruled that reprimands are evaluations for the purposes of section 21.355. *Tave v. Dallas Indep. Sch. Dist.*, Dkt. No. 067-R2-501 (Comm's Educ. 2001). However, we disagree with the Commissioner's ruling in *Tave*. Thus, we find that a letter of reprimand is not confidential under section 21.355 and is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 on that basis. We also note that some of the submitted information consists of blank evaluation forms that do not actually evaluate the performance of a teacher or administrator and a memorandum discussing the evaluation process in general. Accordingly, we conclude that these types of information are not confidential under section 21.355.

Section 552.101 also encompasses information protected by common law privacy. Section 552.102 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy." Gov't Code § 552.102(a). In *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Texas Newspapers*, 652 S.W.2d 546 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref'd n.r.e.), the court ruled that the test to be applied to information claimed to be protected under section 552.102 is the same as the test formulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation v. Texas Industrial Accident Board*, 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976) for information claimed to be protected under the doctrine of common law privacy as incorporated by section 552.101. Accordingly, we address the district's section 552.102 claim in conjunction with its common law privacy claim under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

In *Industrial Foundation*, the Texas Supreme Court stated that information is excepted from disclosure if it (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person and (2) is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. The type of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. *Id.* at 683. This office has found that the following types of information are excepted from required public disclosure under common law privacy: some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps); personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545 (1990); and identities of victims of sexual abuse, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 440 (1986), 393 (1983), 339 (1982). Upon review, we find that the district may not withhold any of the submitted information at issue under section 552.101 or 552.102 on the basis of common law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 444 (1986) (public has legitimate interest in knowing reasons for dismissal, demotion, promotion, or resignation of public employee), 423 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow).

You contend that some of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.117 of the Government Code. Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the current and former home addresses and telephone numbers, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024. 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). Pursuant to section 552.117(a)(1), the district must withhold the information you have marked, in addition to the information we have marked, that pertains to current or former district employees, if these employees elected, prior to the district's receipt of the request for information, to keep such information confidential. Such information may not be withheld for individuals who did not make a timely election.

However, we note that a portion of the remaining submitted information is subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code, which states that "[n]otwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential." Gov't Code § 552.136. Accordingly, the district must withhold the account numbers that you have marked, in addition to the information we have marked, under section 552.136.

You also claim that some of the remaining information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.137 of the Government Code. This provision 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). *See* Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). Section 552.137 does not apply to a government employee's work e-mail address because such an address is not that of the employee as a "member of the public," but is instead the address of the individual as a government employee. In addition, section 552.137 does not apply to a business's general e-mail or website address. The e-mail addresses you have marked do not appear to be of a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). In addition, you inform us that the district has not received consent for the release of the e-mail addresses at issue. Therefore, the district must withhold the e-mail addresses you have marked under section 552.137.

In summary, the district must release the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.022. To the extent that submitted information you have marked is held by the district as an agent of the grand jury, such information is in the grand jury's constructive possession and is not subject to disclosure under the Act. To the extent that this submitted information is not held by the district as an agent of the grand jury, so as to be subject to the Act, it is subject to this ruling. The marked notices and agendas of the public meetings must be released in accordance with the Open Meetings Act. The district may withhold the information it has marked under sections 552.105 and 552.107. The district may withhold the information that we have marked under section 552.111. The marked evaluations must be withheld pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with

section 21.355 of the Education Code. Pursuant to section 552.117(a)(1), the district must withhold the marked information that pertains to current or former district employees, if these employees elected, prior to the district's receipt of the request for information, to keep such information confidential. The district must withhold the marked information under sections 552.136 and 552.137. The remaining 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, 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 "Debbie K. Lee", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Debbie K. Lee
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

DKL/eb

Ref: ID# 247390

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Dianna Pharr
2204 Westlake Drive
Austin, Texas 78746
(w/o enclosures)