



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

February 3, 2014

Ms. Leticia D. McGowan
School Attorney
Dallas Independent School District
3700 Ross Avenue
Dallas, Texas 75204

OR2014-02023

Dear Ms. McGowan:

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# 512887 (ORR# 12604).

The Dallas Independent School District (the "district") received a request for e-mails, memoranda, or other correspondence to or from seven named district employees regarding Group Excellence; e-mails, memoranda, or other correspondence to or from any district employee to a named individual; and audits, reports, or performance reviews regarding Group Excellence for specified time periods. You state the district will make some of the requested information available to the requestor. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107, 552.110, and 552.111 of the Government Code.¹ You also state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of Group Excellence. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified Group Excellence of the request for information and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory

¹Although you raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with Texas Rule of Evidence 503 and Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5, this office has concluded section 552.101 does not encompass discovery privileges. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 1-2 (2002), 575 at 2 (1990). You also claim this information is protected under the attorney-client privilege based on Texas Rule of Evidence 503 and under the attorney work product privilege based on Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5. In this instance, however, the information is properly addressed here under section 552.107, rather than rule 503, and section 552.111, rather than rule 192.5. ORD 676 at 3.

predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in the Act in certain circumstances). We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Although the district argues that the requested information is excepted under section 552.110 of the Government Code, that exception is designed to protect the interests of third parties, not the interests of a governmental body. Thus, we do not address the district's argument under section 552.110. We note an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received comments from Group Excellence explaining why its information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude Group Excellence has a protected proprietary interest in the submitted information. *See id.* § 552.110; Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3. Accordingly, the district may not withhold any of the information at issue on the basis of any proprietary interest Group Excellence may have in it.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. Gov't Code § 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. ORD 676 at 6-7. 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 to only 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 to only 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, 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 the information you have marked constitutes communications between district employees and attorneys for the district that were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the district. You also state the communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find the district may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.²

Section 552.111 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[a]n 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, writ ref’d n.r.e.); *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 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 severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex.*

²As our ruling on this information is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against its disclosure.

Attorney Gen., 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.); *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).

This office has also concluded a preliminary draft of a document 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.

You seek to withhold some of the remaining information under section 552.111 of the Government Code. You state the information you have marked consists of communications between district employees that pertain to policymaking issues of the district. You also state some of this information consists of draft documents and you indicate the draft documents have been released to the public in their final forms. Upon review, we find the district may withhold the draft documents, which we have marked, under section 552.111 of the Government Code. Further, we find the information we have marked consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations pertaining to the policymaking matters of the district. Accordingly, the district may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111. However, the remaining information at issue consists of general administrative or factual information. Therefore, we conclude you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information constitutes internal communications containing advice, recommendations, or opinions reflecting the policymaking processes of the district. Consequently, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Section 552.111 of the Government Code also encompasses the attorney work product privilege found in Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5. *City of Garland*, 22 S.W.3d at 360; Open Records Decision No. 677 at 4-8 (2000). Rule 192.5 defines work product as:

- (1) [M]aterial 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 that 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.

You generally assert some of the remaining information consists of attorney work product. Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate how the information at issue was prepared in anticipation of litigation for the purposes of section 552.111. Consequently, the district may not withhold the remaining information as attorney work product under section 552.111.

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, social security numbers, emergency contact information, 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, except as provided by section 552.024(a-1).³ See Gov't Code §§ 552.117(a)(1), .024. Section 552.024(a-1) of the Government Code provides, "A school district may not require an employee or former employee of the district to choose whether to allow public access to the employee's or former employee's social security number." *Id.* § 552,024(a-1). Thus, the district may withhold under section 552.117 only the home address and telephone number, emergency contact information, and family member information of a current or former employee or official of the district who requests this information be kept confidential under section 552.024. We note section 552.117 is also applicable to personal cellular telephone numbers, provided the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. See Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-6 (1988) (section 552.117 not applicable to cellular telephone numbers paid for by governmental body and intended for official use). Whether

³The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body. See Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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). Thus, information may only be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee 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. Accordingly, if the district employee whose cellular telephone we have marked timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code and the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The district may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.117 if the employee did not make a timely election to keep her information confidential or if the cellular telephone service is paid for by a governmental body.

In summary, the district may withhold the information you have marked 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. If the district employee whose cellular telephone we have marked timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code and the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. 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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, 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 may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Jennifer Luttrall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JL/som

Ref: ID# 512887

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Lauren Sanderson
Regional Manager
Group Excellence
7616 LBJ Freeway, Suite 515
Dallas, Texas 75251
(w/o enclosures)