



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

July 5, 2011

Mr. Christopher B. Gilbert
For Houston Independent School District
Thompson & Horton, L.L.P.
3200 Southwest Freeway, Suite 2000
Houston, Texas 77027

OR2011-09481

Dear Mr. Gilbert:

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# 422726.

The Houston Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for all e-mail correspondence associated with a named district board member from January 14, 2011 to the date of the request. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹ We have also received and considered comments from the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (providing that interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Initially, we note the information we have marked is not responsive to the instant request because it does not pertain to the requested e-mails. This ruling does not address the public

¹We 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.

availability of non-responsive information, and the district is not required to release non-responsive information in response to this request.

You raise section 552.107 of the Government Code for the e-mails in Exhibit C. Section 552.107(1) protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. *Id.* § 552.107(1). 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 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, and lawyer representatives. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). 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.*, 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 pet.). 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 the e-mails in Exhibit C were communicated between district trustees, administrators, and employees and attorneys for the district in furtherance of the rendition of legal services to the district. You state the e-mails have not been and were not intended to be disclosed to third parties. Upon review, we agree the e-mails in Exhibit C constitute privileged attorney-client communications. We conclude the district may withhold the e-mails in Exhibit C under section 552.107 of the Government Code.

You claim the e-mails submitted in Exhibit B are excepted from disclosure under section 552.111 of the Government Code, which 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* ORD 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* ORD 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). When determining if an interagency memorandum is excepted from disclosure under section 552.111, we must consider whether the agencies between which the memorandum is passed share a privity of interest or common deliberative process with regard to the policy matter at issue. *See* Open Records Decision No. 561 at 9 (1990).

You state the e-mails and attachments in Exhibit B contain discussions about district policy with respect to the district’s Apollo and magnet programs, as well as state funding issues. You have identified most of the individuals who are parties to these communications and state they are district officials, employees, and representatives. Upon review, we have marked the information in Exhibit B that consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations of the individuals you identified regarding district policy; therefore, the district may withhold the marked information under section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, the remaining portions of Exhibit B either are purely factual in nature, do not relate to policymaking, or reflect they were communicated with parties you have not identified as sharing a common deliberative process with the district. Thus, we conclude you failed to

demonstrate the applicability of the deliberative process privilege to the remaining information, and the district may not withhold the remaining information in Exhibit B under section 552.111 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. Section 552.101 encompasses the common-law right of privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, such that its release would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be established. *Id.* at 681-82. The types 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. *See id.* at 683. This office has found that some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses are excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps).* Upon review, we find that portions of the remaining information are highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the district must withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. Upon review, we find the remaining information either is not highly intimate or embarrassing or is of legitimate public interest. Therefore, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code may also be applicable to some of the submitted information.² Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the current and former home addresses and telephone numbers, emergency contact information, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who request this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. Act of May 24, 2011, 82nd Leg., R.S., S.B. 1638, § 2 (to be codified as an amendment to Gov’t Code § 552.117(a)). Additionally, section 552.117 encompasses personal cellular telephone numbers, provided the cellular telephone service is paid for by the employee with his or her own funds. *See Open Records Decision No. 670 at 6 (2001) (extending section 552.117 exception to personal cellular telephone number and personal pager number of employee who elects to withhold home telephone number in accordance with section 552.024).* Whether information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time the request for it is

²The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).*

made. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Therefore, the district may only withhold information under section 552.117 on behalf of current or former officials or employees who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for this information was made. For those employees who timely elected to keep their personal information confidential, the district must withhold the employees' personal information, which we have marked, under section 552.117(a)(1). However, the district may only withhold the marked cellular telephone numbers under section 552.117(a)(1) if the employees whose information is at issue pay for the cellular telephone service with personal funds. The district may not withhold this information under section 552.117(a)(1) for those employees who did not make a timely election to keep the information confidential.

Finally, we note the information at issue contains personal e-mail addresses. 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). The e-mail addresses listed in the information at issue are not specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). As such, these e-mail addresses, a representative sample of which we have marked, must be withheld under section 552.137, unless the owners of the addresses have affirmatively consented to their release.³ *See id.* § 552.137(b).

In summary, the district may withhold the e-mails in Exhibit C under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The district may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. If the employees whose personal information we have marked in Exhibit B timely elected to withhold this information under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the district must withhold this information under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. However, the district may only withhold the marked cellular telephone numbers under section 552.117(a)(1) if the employees pay for the cellular telephone service with personal funds. The district must withhold the personal e-mail addresses, a representative sample of which we have marked, under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners of the addresses have affirmatively consented to their release. The remaining information must be released.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other information or any other circumstances.

³Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009) serves as a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold ten categories of information, including e-mail addresses of members of the public under section 552.137, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php, or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General, toll free at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Vanessa Burgess', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Vanessa Burgess
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

VB/dls

Ref: ID# 422726

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)