



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

July 26, 2012

Mr. Deron Robinson
For Red Oak Independent School District
Henslee Schwartz, L.L.P.
306 West 7th Street, Suite 1045
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

OR2012-11688

Dear Mr. Robinson:

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# 460246.

The Red Oak Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for five categories of information concerning a named individual related to a specified topic.¹ You state you will release some of the requested information to the requestor. You also state the district will redact student identifying information pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), section 1232g of title 20 of the United States Code.² You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure

¹You note that the district sought and received clarification of the information requested. See Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing that if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); see also *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or over-broad request for public information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

²We note the United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office (the "DOE") has informed this office that FERPA does not permit a state educational agency or institution to disclose to this office, without parental or an adult student's consent, unredacted, personally identifiable information contained in education records for the purpose of our review in the open records ruling process under the Act. See 34 C.F.R. § 99.3 (defining "personally identifiable information"). The DOE has determined that FERPA determinations must be made by the educational institution from which the education records were obtained. A copy of the DOE's letter to this office may be found on the Office of the Attorney General's website: <http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/20060725usdoe.pdf>.

under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.107, 552.111, and 552.137 of the Government Code.³ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.⁴

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 exception encompasses information other statutes make confidential. You contend some of the responsive information is confidential under section 21.355 of the Education Code, which provides in part that “[a] document evaluating the performance of a teacher or administrator is confidential.” Educ. Code § 21.355(a). 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). We have determined that for purposes of section 21.355, the word “teacher” means a person who 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 who 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 have determined 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.*

You assert a portion of Exhibit C is protected by section 21.355. However, the information at issue consists of a self-evaluation for the chief financial director for the district. Therefore, we find you have failed to demonstrate how the information at issue consists of documents evaluating the performance of a teacher or administrator for the purposes of section 21.355 of the Education Code. Accordingly, the district may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information if it (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts,

³Although you raise section 552.022 of the Government Code, we note this section is not an exception to public disclosure under the Act. Rather, section 552.022 enumerates categories of information that are not excepted from disclosure unless they are expressly confidential under other law. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.022. Further, although you also raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure, this office has concluded section 552.101 does not encompass discovery privileges. *See* Open Records Decision No. 575 at 2 (1990). Although you raise Rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence, we note section 552.107 of the Government Code is the proper exception to raise when asserting the attorney-client privilege for information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code.

⁴We 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.

the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be established. *Id.* at 681-82. This office has found that personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally intimate or embarrassing. *See generally* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 9-10 (employee's designation of retirement beneficiary, choice of insurance carrier, election of optional coverages, direct deposit authorization, forms allowing employee to allocate pretax compensation to group insurance, health care or dependent care), 545 (1990) (deferred compensation information, participation in voluntary investment program, election of optional insurance coverage, mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history). However, there is a legitimate public interest in the essential facts about a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body. *See* ORDs 600 at 9 (information revealing that employee participates in group insurance plan funded partly or wholly by governmental body is not excepted from disclosure), 545 (financial information pertaining to receipt of funds from governmental body or debts owed to governmental body not protected by common-law privacy). Furthermore, this office has noted the public has a legitimate interest in information that relates to public employees and their conduct in the workplace. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 562 at 10 (personnel file information does not involve most intimate aspects of human affairs but in fact touches on matters of legitimate public concern), 470 at 4 (job performance does not generally constitute public employee's private affairs), 444 at 3 (1986) (public has obvious interest in information concerning qualifications and performance of government employees), 405 at 2 (1983) (manner in which public employee's job was performed cannot be said to be of minimal public interest), 329 (1982) (reasons for employee's resignation ordinarily not private).

Upon review, we find the information we have marked is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Therefore, the district must withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find no portion of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Accordingly, no portion of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

You raise section 552.102(a) of the Government Code for the information in Exhibits C and D. Section 552.102(a) 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). We understand you to assert the privacy analysis under section 552.102(a) is the same as the common-law privacy test under section 552.101, which was discussed above. In *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Texas Newspapers, Inc.*, 652 S.W.2d 546, 549-51 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref'd n.r.e.), the court ruled the privacy test under section 552.102(a) is the same as the *Industrial Foundation* privacy test. However, the Texas Supreme Court expressly disagreed with *Hubert's* interpretation of section 552.102(a) and held its privacy standard differs from the *Industrial Foundation* test under section 552.101. *See Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354

S.W.3d 336, 348 (Tex. 2010). The Supreme Court then considered the applicability of section 552.102, not *Industrial Foundation*, and held section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *See id.* at 348. Having carefully reviewed the information at issue, we find no portion of the information at issue is excepted under section 552.102(a), and it may not be withheld on that basis.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information that comes 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. *See 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. *See 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. *See 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 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. *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. *See Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, orig. proceeding). 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 Exhibit B consists of e-mail communications between district employees and outside counsel for the district that were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the district. You state the communications at issue were intended to be confidential and that confidentiality has been maintained. Based on your representations and our review, we conclude the district has established the applicability of

the attorney-client privilege to Exhibit B. Therefore, the district may withhold Exhibit B under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

Next, you raise section 552.111 of the Government Code for Exhibit C. 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. Section 552.111 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 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). We determined section 552.111 excepts from disclosure only those internal communications consisting of advice, recommendations, and opinions reflecting the policymaking processes of the governmental body. *See* ORD 615 at 5. A governmental body’s policymaking functions do not encompass internal administrative or personnel matters, and disclosure of information relating to such matters will not inhibit free discussion among agency personnel as to policy issues. *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). However, 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).

Section 552.111 can also encompass communications between a governmental body and a third-party, including a consultant or other party with a privity of interest. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 631 at 2 (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), 561 at 9 (1990) (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). For section 552.111 to apply, the governmental body must identify the third party and explain the nature of its relationship with the governmental body.

Upon review, we find the information we marked in Exhibit C consists of communications that consist of advice, opinions, or recommendations on the policymaking matters of the district. Accordingly, the marked information may be withheld under section 552.111 of the

Government Code. However, we find the remaining information at issue is general administrative and purely factual information or has been shared with individuals with whom you have not demonstrated a privity of interest. Thus, we find you have failed to show how any of the remaining information at issue constitutes internal communications that consists of advice, opinions, or recommendations on the policymaking matters of the district. Accordingly, the district may not withhold the remaining information at issue in Exhibit C under the deliberative process privilege of section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Section 552.111 also encompasses the attorney work-product privilege found in rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. *City of Garland*, 22 S.W.3d at 360; Open Records Decision No. 677 at 4-8 (2002). Rule 192.5 defines work product as:

(1) material prepared or mental impressions developed in anticipation of litigation or for trial by or for a party or a party's representatives, including the party's attorneys, consultants, sureties, indemnitors, insurers, employees, or agents; or

(2) a communication made in anticipation of litigation or for trial between a party and the party's representatives or among a party's representatives, including the party's attorneys, consultants, sureties, indemnitors, insurers, employees or agents.

TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5(a). A governmental body seeking to withhold information under this exception bears the burden of demonstrating the information was created or developed for trial or in anticipation of litigation by or for a party or a party's representative. *Id.*; ORD 677 at 6-8. In order for this office to conclude the information was made or developed in anticipation of litigation, we must be satisfied that:

a) 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 b) the party resisting discovery believed in good faith that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue and [created or obtained the information] for the purpose of preparing for such litigation.

Nat'l Tank Co. 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; ORD 677 at 7. Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate how the remaining information constitutes material prepared, impressions developed, or a communication made in anticipation of litigation by or for the district. See TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5(a), (b)(1). Accordingly, the district may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.111 of the Government Code on the basis of the work-product privilege.

We note portions of the remaining information may be subject to section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code, which excepts from disclosure the home address and telephone number, emergency contact information, social security number, and family member information of a current or former employee or official of a governmental body who requests this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code.⁵ *See* Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). Whether a particular item of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Thus, information may be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) only on behalf of a current or former employee or official who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. Information may not be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee or official who did not timely request under section 552.024 the information be kept confidential. Therefore, to the extent the individuals whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. Conversely, to the extent the individuals at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024, the district may not withhold the marked information under section 552.117(a)(1).

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). We note section 552.137 is not applicable to an e-mail address provided to a governmental body by a person who has a contractual relationship with the governmental body or by the contractor's agent. *See id.* § 552.137(c)(1). 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, which we have marked, must be withheld under section 552.137, unless the owners of the addresses have affirmatively consented to their release.⁶ *See id.* § 552.137(b).

In summary, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The district may withhold Exhibit B under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The district may withhold the information we have marked in Exhibit C under section 552.111 of the Government Code. To the extent the individuals whose information is at issue timely

⁵The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

⁶Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009) serves as a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain 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.

requested confidentiality, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. Conversely, to the extent the individuals at issue did not timely request confidentiality, the district may not withhold the marked information under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The district must withhold the e-mail addresses 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.

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,



Vanessa Burgess
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

VB/dls

Ref: ID# 460246

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)