



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 11, 2017

Ms. Leticia McGowan  
Assistant General Counsel  
Dallas Independent School District  
3700 Ross Avenue  
Dallas, Texas 75204

OR2017-07662

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# 652954 (ORR# 15923).

The Dallas Independent School District (the "district") received a request for specified information pertaining to a named employee. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107, 552.111, and 552.1116 of the Government Code and privileged under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note portions of the submitted information are subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides, in relevant part, the following:

(a) [T]he following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

...

(3) information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of public or other funds by a governmental body[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(3). Portions of the submitted information consist of information in a contract relating to the expenditure of funds by a governmental body, which is subject to section 552.022(a)(3). *Id.* Thus, the district must release this information unless it is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* Although you seek to withhold the information at issue under sections 552.107(1), 552.111, and 552.116 of the Government Code, these sections are discretionary exceptions to disclosure and do not make information confidential under the Act. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 at 7 (1987) (deliberative process privilege under statutory predecessor to section 552.111 subject to waiver), 676 at 10-11 (attorney-client privilege under Gov't Code § 552.107(1) may be waived), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Accordingly, the district may not withhold the information at issue pursuant to section 552.107, 552.111, or 552.116 of the Government Code. However, the Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Evidence are "other law" for purposes of section 552.022(a). *In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328 (Tex. 2001). Thus, we will consider your assertion of the attorney client privilege under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 for the information subject to section 552.022(a)(3).

Rule 503(b)(1) provides:

A client has a privilege to refuse to disclose and to prevent any other person from disclosing confidential communications made to facilitate the rendition of professional legal services to the client:

(A) between the client or the client's representative and the client's lawyer or the lawyer's representative;

(B) between the client's lawyer and the lawyer's representative;

(C) by the client, the client's representative, the client's lawyer, or the lawyer's representative to a lawyer representing another party in a pending action or that lawyer's representative, if the communications concern a matter of common interest in the pending action;

(D) between the client's representatives or between the client and the client's representative; or

(E) among lawyers and their representatives representing the same client.

Tex. R. Evid. 503(b)(1). A communication is "confidential" if not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made to further the rendition of professional legal services to the client or reasonably necessary to transmit the communication. *Id.* 503(a)(5).

Accordingly, in order to withhold attorney-client privileged information from disclosure under rule 503, a governmental body must 1) show that the document is a communication transmitted between privileged parties or reveals a confidential communication; 2) identify the parties involved in the communication; and 3) show that the communication is confidential by explaining that it was not intended to be disclosed to third persons and that it was made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client. *See* ORD 676. Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the entire communication is confidential under rule 503 provided the client has not waived the privilege or the communication does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in rule 503(d). *Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein); *In re Valero Energy Corp.*, 973 S.W.2d 453, 457 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1998, orig. proceeding) (privilege attaches to complete communication, including factual information).

The information subject to section 552.022(a)(3) is attached to a communication you assert is between the district's legal counsel and district employees that was made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of legal services. You state the communication was intended to be confidential and indicate that the confidentiality has been maintained. Based on your representations and our review, we find the district has demonstrated the information subject to section 552.022(a)(3) of the Government Code is part of a privileged attorney-client communication. Thus, the district may withhold the information subject to section 552.022(a)(3) pursuant to rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.

Next, we address your arguments against disclosure of the information not subject to section 552.022. Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. The elements of the privilege under section 552.107 are the same as those for rule 503. 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* ORD 676 at 6-7. Section 552.107(1) generally excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege. *See Huie*, 922 S.W.2d at 923.

You assert the submitted information consists of communications between the district's legal counsel and district employees in their capacities as clients. You state the communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the district and its employees. Further, you state the communications were made in confidence and not intended for release to third parties, and the confidentiality of the communications has been maintained. Upon review, we find the district has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the remaining information. Thus, the district may generally withhold the information not subject to section 552.022(a)(3) under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. We note, however, some of these otherwise privileged e-mail strings include e-mails received from or sent to non-privileged parties. Furthermore, if the e-mails received from or sent to non-privileged parties are removed from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear and stand alone, they are responsive to the request for

information. Therefore, if these non-privileged e-mails, which we marked, are maintained by the district separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then the district may not withhold these non-privileged e-mails under section 552.107(1). In that event, we address your remaining arguments against disclosure of the non-privileged e-mails.

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. 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).

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 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. Section 552.111 is not applicable to a communication between the governmental body and a third party unless the

governmental body establishes it has a privity of interest or common deliberative process with the third party. *See* ORD 561.

You seek to withhold the remaining information under section 552.111 of the Government Code. You state the remaining information consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations of employees and officials of the district regarding policymaking matters. Upon review, we find the remaining information consists of communications with individuals with whom you have not demonstrated the district shares a privity of interest or common deliberative process. Thus, you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information reveals advice, opinions, or recommendations that pertain to policymaking. Accordingly, the district may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.111 of the Government Code on the basis of the deliberative process privilege.

Section 552.116 of the Government Code provides the following:

(a) An audit working paper of an audit of the state auditor or the auditor of a state agency, an institution of higher education as defined by Section 61.003, Education Code, a county, a municipality, a school district, a hospital district, or a joint board operating under Section 22.074, Transportation Code, including any audit relating to the criminal history background check of a public school employee, is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021. If information in an audit working paper is also maintained in another record, that other record is not excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 by this section.

(b) In this section:

(1) "Audit" means an audit authorized or required by a statute of this state or the United States, the charter or an ordinance of a municipality, an order of the commissioners court of a county, the bylaws adopted by or other action of the governing board of a hospital district, a resolution or other action of a board of trustees of a school district, including an audit by the district relating to the criminal history background check of a public school employee, or a resolution or other action of a joint board described by Subsection (a) and includes an investigation.

(2) "Audit working paper" includes all information, documentary or otherwise, prepared or maintained in conducting an audit or preparing an audit report, including:

(A) intra-agency and interagency communications; and

(B) drafts of the audit report or portions of those drafts.

Gov't Code § 552.116. For the purposes of section 552.116, a school district must establish that an audit is authorized by a resolution or other action of a board of trustees of a school district. *Id.* § 552.116(b)(1). You inform us the remaining information pertains to an internal audit being conducted by the district's Internal Audit department. Although you state "the audit was authorized," you provide no arguments demonstrating under what authority the audit was authorized. Thus, we conclude you have failed to establish section 552.116 is applicable to any portion of the remaining information, and none of the remaining information may be withheld on this basis.

We note some of the remaining information may be subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> 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 employees of a governmental body who request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. *Id.* § 552.117(a)(1). Section 552.117(a)(1) also applies to the personal cellular telephone number of a current or former official or employee of a governmental body, provided the cellular telephone service is not paid by a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-6 (1988). Whether 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). Therefore, a governmental body must withhold information under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee only if the individual made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for this information was made. Therefore, if the employee whose information is at issue 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 cellular telephone number we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. Conversely, if the employee at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024 or the cellular telephone service is paid for by a governmental body, the district may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code.

In summary, the district may withhold the information subject to section 552.022(a)(3) of the Government Code under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. The district may generally withhold the remaining information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. If the non-privileged e-mails we marked are maintained by the district separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, the district must release them but withhold the cellular telephone number we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code, if the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. The district must release the remaining information.

---

<sup>1</sup>The 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 No. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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](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,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ashley Crutchfield". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial 'A' and 'C'.

Ashley Crutchfield  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

AC/bw

Ref: ID# 652954

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)