



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 17, 2016

Ms. Kristi Godden
Counsel for Seguin Independent School District
O'Hanlon, McCollom & Demerath
808 West Avenue
Austin, Texas 78701

OR2016-25697

Dear Ms. Godden:

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# 634639 (ID# SISD-16-005).

The Seguin Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for all e-mails exchanged between named individuals for a specified period of time.¹ You claim portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under

¹We note the district sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing 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). You inform us the district also sent the requestor an estimate of charges pursuant to section 552.2615 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.2615. The estimate of charges required the requestor to provide deposit for payment of anticipated costs under section 552.263 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.263(a). You inform us the district received the required deposit on August 24, 2016. *See id.* § 552.263(e) (if governmental body requires deposit or bond for anticipated costs pursuant to section 552.263, request for information is considered to have been received on date governmental body receives bond or deposit).

sections 552.101, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

Initially, you state some of the responsive information was the subject of a previous request for information, in response to which this office issued Open Records Letter No. 2016-13210 (2016). In that ruling, we determined, in pertinent part, the district may withhold the information at issue under section 552.107 of the Government Code. There is no indication the law, facts, and circumstances on which the prior ruling was based have changed. Accordingly, we conclude the district may continue to rely on Open Records Letter No. 2016-13210 as a previous determination and withhold the information at issue in accordance with that ruling. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (so long as law, facts, and circumstances on which prior ruling was based have not changed, first type of previous determination exists where requested information is precisely same information as was addressed in prior attorney general ruling, ruling is addressed to same governmental body, and ruling concludes information is or is not excepted from disclosure).

Section 552.107(1) protects information that comes within the attorney-client privilege. *See* 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. 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 “to facilitate 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 only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1)(A), (B), (C), (D), (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: (A) to whom disclosure is made to further the rendition of professional legal services to the client; or (B) reasonably necessary to transmit the

²We assume 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 those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

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 consists of communications involving district employees and officials and counsel for the district. You state the communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the district and these communications have remained confidential. Upon review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Thus, the district may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

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*, 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, 364 (Tex. 2000) (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking). A governmental body’s policymaking functions 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. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152, 157 (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, section 552.111 protects the factual information. *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 which the governmental body establishes it has a privity of interest or common deliberative process. *See* Open Records Decision No. 561 at 9 (1990) (section 552.111 encompasses communications with party with which governmental body has privity of interest or common deliberative process). 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.

You state some of the submitted information consists of communications between district employees and officials of the district and other third parties who share a privity of interest pertaining to the district's policymaking processes. Upon review, we agree the information we marked constitutes advice, opinions, and recommendations relating to the district's policymaking. Therefore, we find the district may withhold the information we marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, we find some the remaining information at issue consists of either general administrative information that does not relate to policymaking, information that is purely factual in nature, or information communicated to parties with whom the district did not demonstrate it shares a privity of interest. Thus, we find the district has failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue is excepted under section 552.111. Accordingly, the district may not withhold the remaining information at issue 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 doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) 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 satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). Upon review, we find some of the remaining information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the district must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code 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.³ *See* Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). 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 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. We have marked the cellular telephone numbers of district employees and other personal information. Therefore, if the employees at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code and a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone services, the district must withhold the types of information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. Conversely, if the employees at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024 or a governmental body pays for the cellular telephone services, 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 id.* § 552.137(a)-(c). However, section 552.137 does not apply to an institutional e-mail address, the general e-mail address of a business, an e-mail address of a person who has a contractual relationship with a governmental body, an e-mail address of a vendor who seeks to contract with a governmental body, an e-mail address maintained by a governmental entity for one of its officials or employees, or an e-mail address provided to a governmental body on a letterhead. *See id.* § 552.137(c). Additionally, section 552.137 does not apply to the private e-mail addresses of government officials who use their private e-mail addresses to conduct official government business. *Austin Bulldog v. Leffingwell*, 490 S.W.3d 240 (Tex. App.—Austin 2016, no pet.). Accordingly, the district must withhold the personal e-mail addresses we marked in the remaining information under section 552.137, unless the individuals to whom the e-mail addresses belong affirmatively consent to their release, the e-mail addresses belong to government officials who use their private e-mail addresses to conduct official government business, or subsection (c) applies.

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).

In summary, the district may rely on Open Records Letter No. 2016-13210 and withhold the information it marked in accordance with that ruling. The district may withhold the information you have marked under section 52.107(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 at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code and a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone services, the district must withhold the types of information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The district must withhold the personal e-mail addresses we marked in the remaining information under section 552.137, unless the individuals to whom the e-mail addresses belong affirmatively consent to their release, the e-mail addresses belong to government officials who use their private e-mail addresses to conduct official government business, or subsection (c) applies. 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,



Kaelan A. Henze
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KAH/eb

Ref: ID# 634639

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)