



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

June 2, 2008

Ms. LeAnne Lundy
Feldman, Rogers, Morris, & Grover, L.L.P.
5718 Westheimer Road, Suite 1200
Houston, Texas 77057

OR2008-07414

Dear Ms. Lundy:

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# 311625.

The Spring Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for all records and files pertaining to the requestor. You state that some information has been released to the requestor. You also indicate that the district has redacted some of the requested information pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), 20 U.S.C. §1232(a).¹ You claim that the remaining requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, 552.116, and 552.137

¹We note that the United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office (the "DOE") informed this office that FERPA, 20 U.S.C. § 1232(a), does not permit state and local educational authorities to disclose to this office, without parental consent, unredacted, personally identifiable information contained in education records for the purpose of our review in the open records ruling process under the Act. The DOE has determined that FERPA determinations must be made by the educational authority in possession of the education records. We have posted a copy of the letter from the DOE to this office on the Attorney General's website: <http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/20060725usdoe.pdf>.

of the Government Code.² We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.³

Initially, we note that a portion of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides in part:

(a) 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 Section 552.108;

...

(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 information at issue includes a completed audit and account information used to document the receipt and expenditure of school funds. The district must release this information unless it is expressly confidential under other law. You claim that the information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.116 of the Government Code. We note that these sections are discretionary exceptions that protect the governmental body's interests and may be waived. *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 section 552.103); Open Records Decision No. 542 at 4 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.103 may be waived). As such, the district may not withhold the information that is subject to section 552.022 under section 552.103 or section 552.116.

You claim that the information that is not subject to section 552.022 is protected under section 552.103, which provides in part:

²Although you initially raised sections 552.111, 552.117, and 552.147 of the Government Code, you have not submitted arguments explaining how these exceptions apply to the submitted information. Therefore, we presume that you have withdrawn these exceptions. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302.

³We 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.

(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 sufficient to establish the applicability of section 552.103 to the information that it seeks to withhold. To meet this burden, the governmental body must demonstrate: (1) that litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date of its receipt of the request for information and (2) that the information at issue is related to that litigation. *See Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, no pet.); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.). Both elements of the test must be met in order for information to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.103. *See Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990).*

Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986).* To demonstrate that litigation is reasonably anticipated, the governmental body must furnish concrete evidence that litigation involving a specific matter is realistically contemplated and is more than mere conjecture. *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. *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 the requestor is the subject of the instant request for information, and has been consulting with an attorney. You assert that the district reasonably anticipates litigation because the requestor "has threatened, on multiple occasions and to various persons that he

intends to sue SISD and certain employees of SISD.” In support of your claim, you reference the original information request and have submitted e-mail correspondence written by the requestor in which he states that he has been in contact with an attorney about the situation at issue. You have not informed us, however, that the requestor has actually taken any concrete steps toward the initiation of litigation. *See* ORD 331. Consequently, you have not established that the district reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the request for information. Accordingly, the district may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code 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 protected by other statutes. Section 21.355 of the Education Code 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 or an administrator. *See* Open Records Decision No. 643 (1996). In Open Records Decision No. 643, we determined that a “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; *see Abbott v. North East Indep. Sch. Dist.*, No. 03-04-00744-CV, 2006 WL 1293545 (Tex. App.—Austin May 12, 2006, no pet.) (concluding that written reprimand constitutes evaluation for purposes of Educ. Code § 21.355).

You contend that documents 80 and 98 of Exhibit C are confidential under section 21.355 of the Education Code. You state that the individual at issue holds a teaching certificate and indicate she was engaged in teaching at the time of the evaluation. Upon review of the submitted information, we agree that the documents are written reprimands, and are therefore subject to section 21.355 of the Education Code. Accordingly, the district must withhold documents 80 and 98 of Exhibit C on this basis.

You next claim that some of the information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code. Section 552.107 protects information that falls 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 Inc. 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)-(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. Finally, the attorney-client privilege applies only to a confidential communication, 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).

The information you seek to withhold under section 552.107 is contained in documents 106 through 119 of Exhibit C. You state that these documents consist of communications between the district and the district's attorney regarding the legal issues relating to this particular situation. Upon review, we agree that the district may withhold documents 106 through 115 of Exhibit C under section 552.107 of the Government Code. However, you have failed to demonstrate how section 552.107 is applicable to documents 116 through 119. Therefore, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information pursuant to section 552.107 of the Government Code.

Section 552.116 of the Government Code provides:

- (a) An audit working paper of an audit of the state auditor or the auditor of a state agency, an institution of higher education as defined by Section 61.003, Education Code, a county, a municipality, a school district, or a joint board operating under Section 22.074, Transportation Code, including any audit relating to the criminal history background check of a public school employee, is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021. If information in an audit working paper is also maintained

- in another record, that other record is not excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 by this section.

(b) In this section:

(1) "Audit" means an audit authorized or required by a statute of this state or the United States, the charter or an ordinance of a municipality, an order of the commissioners court of a county, a resolution or other action of a board of trustees of a school district, including an audit by the district relating to the criminal history background check of a public school employee, or a resolution or other action of a joint board described by Subsection (a) and includes an investigation.

(2) "Audit working paper" includes all information, documentary or otherwise, prepared or maintained in conducting an audit or preparing an audit report, including:

(A) intra-agency and interagency communications; and

(B) drafts of the audit report or portions of those drafts.

Gov't Code § 552.116. You argue that a portion of the remaining information is subject to section 552.116. You state that this information consists of working papers that were maintained by the district's internal auditor during the course of an audit authorized by the district's board of trustees. Based on your representations and our review, we agree that documents 78, 79, 81-90, 92-97, and 99-105 constitute audit working papers under section 552.116, and may be withheld on that basis.

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). *See* Gov't Code § 552.137 (a)-(c). You have marked a personal e-mail address in document 16 that is subject to section 552.137. The e-mail address is not a type specifically excluded by section 552.137 (c). You inform us that the owner of the e-mail address has not affirmatively consented to its public disclosure. We therefore conclude that the district must withhold the marked e-mail address in document 16 under section 552.137 of the Government Code.

In summary, you must withhold (1) documents 80 and 98 under section 552.101 of the Government Code pursuant to section 21.355 of the Education Code; and (2) the e-mail address that you have marked in document 16 under section 552.137 of the Government Code. You may withhold documents 106 through 115 of Exhibit C under section 552.107

of the Government Code. You may also withhold documents 78, 79, 81-90, 92-97, and 99-105 under section 552.116 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.

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 file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, 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 challenge 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 cursive script that reads "Bill Longley".

Bill Longley
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

BL/eeg

Ref: ID# 311625

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Ralph W. Sanders
Director of Choral Activities
Westfield High School
16713 Ella Boulevard
Houston, Texas 77090
(w/o enclosures)