



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 6, 2017

Ms. Annabel Canchola
Counsel for Stamford Independent School District
Powell & Leon, LLP
115 Wild Basin Road, Suite 106
Austin, Texas 78746

OR2017-15081

Dear Ms. Canchola:

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# 664984.

The Stamford Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for all e-mails, text messages, phone logs, and calendar events pertaining to a named individual during a specified period of time.¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107, 552.111, 552.114, and 552.136 of the

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).

Government Code.² We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative samples of information.³

Initially, we note the United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office (the “DOE”) has informed this office the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (“FERPA”), section 1232g of title 20 of the United States Code, does not permit state and local educational authorities 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.⁴ Consequently, state and local educational authorities that receive a request for education records from a member of the public under the Act must not submit education records to this office in unredacted form, that is, in a form in which “personally identifiable information” is disclosed. *See* 34 C.F.R. § 99.3 (defining “personally identifiable information”). You have submitted redacted education records for our review. We note the requestor is a parent of the student to whom the submitted information pertains. Because our office is prohibited from reviewing these education records to determine whether appropriate redactions under FERPA have been made, we will not address the applicability of FERPA to any of the submitted records, other than to note parents and their legal representatives have a right of access to their child’s education records. *See* 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(a)(1)(A); 34 C.F.R. § 99.3; *see also Equal Employment Opportunity Comm’n v. City of Orange, Tex.*, 905 F. Supp. 381, 382 (E.D. Tex. 1995) (holding FERPA prevails over inconsistent provision of state law). Such determinations under FERPA must be made by the educational authority in possession of the education records. The DOE also has informed our office, however, a parent’s right of access under FERPA to information about the parent’s child does not prevail over an educational institution’s right to assert the attorney-client privilege. Therefore, we will address your assertion of the attorney-client privilege under section 552.107 of the Government Code to the information at issue.

Next, we note some of the requested information may have been the subject of a previous request for information, in response to which this office issued Open Records Letter No. 2017-11009 (2017). In Open Records Letter No. 2017-11009, we determined the district

²We note although you raise section 552.026 of the Government Code as an exception to disclosure, this section is not an exception to public disclosure under the Act. Rather, section 552.026 provides the Act does not require the release of information contained in education records except in conformity with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974. Gov’t Code § 552.026.

³We assume the representative samples of records submitted to this office are 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.

⁴A copy of this letter may be found on the Office of the Attorney General’s website at <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/files/og/20060725usdoe.pdf>

must release the submitted information. We have no indication the law, facts, or circumstances on which the prior ruling was based have changed. Accordingly, we conclude the district must continue to rely on Open Records Letter No. 2017-11009 as a previous determination and release the identical information in accordance with that ruling. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 at 6-7 (2001) (discussing criteria for first type of previous determination).

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming 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. 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 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 Exhibit E consists of confidential communications involving the district’s attorneys and a district employee made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the district. You state the confidentiality of these communications has been maintained. Based on these representations and our review, we find the district has

demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Thus, the district may withhold Exhibit E 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, 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).

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 Exhibit F under section 552.111 of the Government Code. You state the information at issue consists of communications between employees and officials of the district and drafts of policymaking documents intended for release in final form. You state these communications include advice, opinion, and recommendations related to policymaking matters of the district. Upon review, we find the district has demonstrated some of the submitted information consists of advice, opinions, or recommendations on the policymaking matters of the district. Thus, the district may withhold the information we marked in Exhibit F under section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, we find the remaining information at issue consists of information that is administrative or purely factual in nature or does not pertain to policymaking. Thus, you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue reveals advice, opinions, or recommendations that pertain to policymaking. Accordingly, the district may not withhold any portion of the remaining information in Exhibit F under section 552.111 of the Government Code on the basis of the deliberative process privilege.

Section 552.107(2) of the Government Code provides information is excepted from disclosure if “a court by order has prohibited disclosure of the information.” Gov’t Code § 552.107(2). You have submitted copies of a Final Judgement and a Temporary Order that were issued by the District Court of the 300th Judicial District in Brazoria County. However, neither this Final Judgement nor this Temporary Order prohibits the district from releasing any of the requested information to the requestor pursuant to the Act. Thus, we conclude the district has not established a court has prohibited disclosure of any of the information at issue to the requestor. Therefore, we find the district may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue from the requestor under section 552.107(2) of the Government Code.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides, “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential.” *Id.* § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). Upon review, however, we find you have not demonstrated any of the information at issue consists of access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. Accordingly, the district may not withhold any portion of the remaining information at issue under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, the district must continue to rely on Open Records Letter No. 2017-11009 as a previous determination and release the identical information in accordance with that ruling. The district may withhold Exhibit E under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The district may withhold the information we marked in Exhibit F under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The district must release the remaining information.

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'SMP', is written over the word 'Sincerely,'.

Sidney M. Pounds
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

SMP/sdk

Ref: ID# 664984

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)