



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

December 12, 2008

Ms. Denise Nance Pierce  
Bickerstaff Heath Delgado Acosta L.L.P.  
816 Congress Avenue, Suite 1700  
Austin, Texas 78701

OR2008-16983

Dear Ms. Pierce :

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# 329914.

The Austin Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for all documents and materials relating to a grievance filed by a specific individual against the district, including tapes or transcriptions. You state you have released some of the requested information to the requestor. You claim that the remaining information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that a document within Exhibit E-8, which we have marked, is not responsive to the instant request for information because it was created after the request was received. This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the request and the district is not required to release that information in response to the request.

---

<sup>1</sup>Although the district initially raised sections 552.102, 552.106, 552.117, 552.136, and 552.137, in subsequent correspondence with our office you did not provide arguments explaining how these exceptions apply to the submitted information. Therefore, we presume that the district has withdrawn the arguments under these exceptions. See Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302. Furthermore, although you raise Texas Rule of Evidence 503, we note that, in this instance, the proper exception to raise when asserting the attorney-client privilege for information not subject to section 552.022 is section 552.107. See Open Records Decision Nos. 677 (2002), 676 at 6 (2002).

Next, we note that the submitted information includes education records. The United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office has informed this office that the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("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.<sup>2</sup> Consequently, state and local educational authorities that receive a request for education records from a member of the public under the Act must not submit education records to this office in unredacted form, that is, in a form in which "personally identifiable information" is disclosed. *See* 34 C.F.R. § 99.3 (defining "personally identifiable information"). You have submitted, among other things, unredacted education records for our review. Because our office is prohibited from reviewing these education records to determine the applicability of FERPA, we will not address FERPA with respect to these records. *See* 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(a)(1)(A); 34 C.F.R. § 99.3. Such determinations under FERPA must be made by the educational authority in possession of the education records.<sup>3</sup> However, we will consider your claimed exceptions to the submitted information.

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 551.104(c) of the Government Code provides that "[t]he certified agenda or tape of a closed meeting is available for public inspection and copying only under a court order issued under Subsection (b)(3)." Thus, such information cannot be released to a member of the public in response to an open records request.<sup>4</sup> *See* Open Records Decision No. 495 (1988). You inform us that the responsive information includes an audio recording of a closed meeting of the district. Therefore, the district must withhold the audio recording pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 551.104(c) of the Government Code.

You also assert that some of the submitted information is excepted from public disclosure pursuant to 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

---

<sup>2</sup>A copy of this letter may be found on the Office of the Attorney General's website: <http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/20060725usdoe.pdf>.

<sup>3</sup>In the future, if the district does obtain parental consent to submit unredacted education records and the district seeks a ruling from this office on the proper redaction of those education records in compliance with FERPA, we will rule accordingly.

<sup>4</sup>We note that the district is not required to submit the certified agenda or audio recording of a closed meeting to this office for review. *See* Open Records Decision No. 495 at 4 (1988) (attorney general lacks authority to review certified agendas or tapes of executive sessions to determine whether a governmental body may withhold such information under statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.101).

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 Texas 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, lawyer representatives, and a lawyer representing another party in a pending action and concerning a matter of common interest therein. See 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. 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).

You state that Exhibits B, C, D-1, D-2, D-3, and E-1 through E-7 include communications between district attorneys and district officials that were made for the purpose of providing legal advice to the district. You state that these communications were made in confidence and have maintained their confidentiality. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information you seek to withhold under section 552.107. Accordingly, the district may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.107 of the Government Code.

You assert section 552.111 for information included within Exhibit F. 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 (1993), 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 ORD 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). 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. v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.); ORD 615 at 4-5.

You state that the information within Exhibit F consists of the advice, opinions, and recommendation of a district employee. You state that these opinions involve policymaking matters relating to the district. Upon review of your representations and the information at issue, we agree that some of the information included in Exhibit F consists of the advice, opinions, or recommendations of a district employee regarding policymaking matters. However, you have failed to establish that the remaining information, which consists of general factual information, consists of advice, opinions, or recommendations for purposes of section 552.111. Therefore, section 552.111 is not applicable to the remaining information in Exhibit F. Accordingly, the district may only withhold the information we have marked within Exhibit F under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

In summary, we do not address the applicability of FERPA to any of the submitted records. The district may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.107 of the Government Code. The information we have marked within Exhibit F may be withheld under section 552.111 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). If the governmental body does not file suit over 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,

Christina Alvarado  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CA/ma

Ref: ID# 329914

Enc. Submitted documents

cc: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)