



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 20, 2017

Mr. Lucas Henry
Counsel for the Frisco Independent School District
Abernathy Roeder Boyd Hullett
1700 Redbud Boulevard, Suite 300
McKinney, Texas 75070-1210

OR2017-28927

Dear Mr. Henry:

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# 689099 (File No. 278).

The Frisco Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for all e-mails sent or received by specified individuals pertaining to 25 specified terms during a specified time period. You state the district released some information to the requestor. Additionally, you state the district will redact information pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(a).¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, 552.111, 552.117, and 552.137 of the Government Code.² We have considered the exceptions you

¹The United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office (the "DOE") has informed this office FERPA 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. The DOE has determined FERPA determinations must be made by the educational authority in possession of the educational records. We have posted a copy of the letter from the DOE on the Attorney General's website at <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/files/og/20060725usdoe.pdf>.

²We note although you raise section 552.102 of the Government Code, you make no arguments to support this assertion. Therefore, we assume you have withdrawn your claim that this exception applies to the submitted information. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302.

claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.³ We have also received and considered comments submitted by the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (providing that interested party may submit written comments regarding why information should or should not be released).

Initially, we address the requestor's assertion the district failed to comply with its procedural obligations under section 552.301 of the Government Code. Section 552.301 of the Government Code prescribes the procedures that a governmental body must follow in asking this office to decide whether requested information is excepted from public disclosure. *See id.* § 552.301. Pursuant to section 552.301(b), a governmental body must ask for a decision from this office and state the exceptions that apply within ten business days of receiving the written request. *See id.* § 552.301(b). Further, pursuant to section 552.301(e), a governmental body is required to submit to this office within fifteen business days of receiving an open records request (1) general written comments stating the reasons why the stated exceptions apply that would allow the information to be withheld, (2) a copy of the written request for information, (3) a signed statement or sufficient evidence showing the date the governmental body received the written request, and (4) a copy of the specific information requested or representative samples, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the documents. *Id.* § 552.301(e).

The district informs us it received the instant request for information on September 21, 2017. The district provided the requestor with a cost estimate and a request for a deposit under section 552.263 of the Government Code. *See id.* §§ 552.2615(a), .263(a). The district informs us the requestor narrowed her request in response to the cost estimate on September 29, 2017. Thus, September 29, 2017, is the date on which the district is deemed to have received the request. *See id.* § 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 governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of unclear or overbroad request, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed). Additionally, we understand the district was closed on October 9, 2017, in observance of Columbus Day. This office does not count the date the request was received or the date the governmental body was closed as business days for the purpose of calculating a governmental body's deadlines under the Act. Accordingly, you were required to provide the information required by section 552.301(b) by October 13, 2017. Moreover, you were required to provide the information required by section 552.301(e) by October 20, 2017. You provided the information required by section 552.301(b) in an envelope meter marked October 12, 2017 and the information required by section 552.301(e) in an envelope meter

³We 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 that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

marked October 20, 2017. *See* Gov't Code § 552.308(a)(1) (describing rules for calculating submission dates of documents sent via first class United States mail, common or contract carrier, or interagency mail). Thus, we find the district complied with section 552.301 of the Government Code in requesting this decision from our office.

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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate 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 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. *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 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 marked consists of communications between attorneys for the district and district employees that were made for the purpose of providing legal services to the district. You state the communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find the information at issue consists of privileged attorney-client communications the district may generally withhold 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) 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).

You seek to withhold some of the remaining information under section 552.111 of the Government Code. You state the information at issue consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations of employees and officials of the district regarding policymaking matters. Upon review, we find the district may withhold the information we marked 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 was shared with individuals you have not demonstrated share a privity of interest or common deliberative process with the district. 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 at issue under section 552.111 of the Government Code on the basis of the deliberative process privilege.

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. *See Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1)*. 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 only withhold under section 552.117 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. 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 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 employee at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the district must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the district may only withhold the marked cellular telephone number if the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. Conversely, to the extent the employee at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024, the district may not withhold the information under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code.

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). *Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c)*. The e-mail addresses at issue are not a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c) of

the Government Code. Accordingly, the district must withhold the e-mail addresses we marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners of the e-mail addresses affirmatively consent to their release.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” *Id.* § 552.101. This section encompasses information protected by other statutes. Section 21.355 of the Education Code provides, in relevant part, “[a] document evaluating the performance of a teacher or administrator is confidential.” Educ. Code § 21.355(a). The Third Court of Appeals has concluded a written reprimand constitutes an evaluation for purposes of section 21.355 because “it reflects the principal's judgment regarding [a teacher's] actions, gives corrective direction, and provides for further review.” *Abbott v. North East Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 212 S.W.3d 364 (Tex. App.—Austin 2006, no pet.). 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 administrator. *See* Open Records Decision No. 643 (1996). In Open Records Decision No. 643, we determined 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 and who is in the process of teaching, as that term is commonly defined, at the time of the evaluation. *See id.* at 4. Further, in Open Records Decision No. 643, we determined an “administrator” for purposes of 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 as an administrator, as that term is commonly defined, at the time of the evaluation. *Id.*

You assert the remaining information contains confidential evaluations of employees of the district. You inform us, and provide documentation demonstrating, the employees were certified as teachers or administrators by the State Board of Educator Certification and were acting as teachers or administrators at the time the evaluations were prepared. Upon review, however, we find the remaining information does not evaluate any employee for purposes of section 21.355. Accordingly the district may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also 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. However, we find the district has failed to demonstrate the remaining information it marked is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public interest. Accordingly,

the district may not withhold the remaining information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the district may generally withhold the information you marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code; however, 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, then the district may not withhold these non-privileged e-mails under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The district may withhold the information we marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. To the extent the employees at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the district must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the district may only withhold the marked cellular telephone number if the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. The district must withhold the e-mail addresses we marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners of the e-mail addresses affirmatively consent to their release. 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,



Ashley Crutchfield
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

AC/sb

Ref: ID# 689099

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)