



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 23, 2022

Ms. Mariana G. Evans
Counsel for the Clear Creek Independent School District
Roger, Morris & Grover, LLP
5718 Westheimer Road, Suite 1200
Houston, Texas 77057

OR2022-05513

Dear Ms. Evans:

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# 929365 (TPIA# 102040).

The Clear Creek Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for all communications received from or sent to a named individual containing specified terms during a particular time period, as well as the named individual's calendar for a particular time period. The district states it will release some information and will rely on Open Records Letter Nos. 2021-06239 (2021) and 2021-28236 (2021) as previous determinations and withhold or release some of the requested information in accordance with those rulings.¹ The district claims some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107 and 552.111 of the Government Code.² We have considered the claimed exceptions and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.³

¹ 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 that information is or is not excepted from disclosure).

² Although you also raise Texas Rule of Evidence 503, we note the proper exception to raise when asserting the attorney-client privilege for information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code is section 552.107 of the Government Code. See Open Records Decision No. 676 at 1-2 (2002).

³ We 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

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming 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. *See* ORD 676 at 6-7. 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). 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.*, 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).

The district claims the information it marked is protected by section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The district states the information at issue consists of communications between attorneys for the district, district employees and officials, and privileged parties that were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the district. The district also states these communications were intended to be, and have remained, confidential. Based upon these representations and our review, we find the district has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Accordingly, the district may generally withhold the information it marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.⁴ We note, however, one of the otherwise

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.

⁴ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

privileged e-mail strings include an e-mail and attachment received from non-privileged parties. Furthermore, if the e-mail and attachment received from the non-privileged parties are removed from the otherwise privileged e-mail string in which they appear and stand alone, they are responsive to the request for information. Therefore, if the non-privileged e-mail and attachment, which we have marked, are maintained by the district separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail string in which they appear, then the district may not withhold the non-privileged e-mail and attachment under section 552.107(1).

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; *see also City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351, 364 (Tex. 2000); *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.). 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). However, 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. ORD 615 at 5-6; *see also Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d at 364 (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking).

Further, section 552.111 does not protect facts and written observations of facts and events severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *See Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 37 S.W.3d at 157; 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.

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 id.*

The district asserts portions of the remaining information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The district states the information at issue consists of communications containing advice, opinions, and recommendations of district employees and officials and third party advisors with whom the district shares a privity of interest or common deliberative process. Upon review, we find the district may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code.⁵ However, we find the remaining information at issue consists of information that is administrative or purely factual in nature, does not pertain to policymaking, or was received from or sent to 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 at issue under section 552.111 of the Government Code on the basis of the deliberative process privilege.

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).⁶ *See* Gov’t Code § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail address at issue is not excluded by subsection (c). Accordingly, the district must withhold the e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner affirmatively consents to its public disclosure.

We note some of the remaining information at issue may be protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception

⁵ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining argument against disclosure of the submitted information.

⁶ 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 Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

applies to the information. *Id.*; see Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit.

In summary, the district may generally withhold the information it marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code; however, if the non-privileged e-mail and attachment we have marked are maintained by the district separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail string in which they appear, then the district may not withhold the non-privileged e-mail and attachment under section 552.107(1). The district may withhold information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The district must withhold the e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner affirmatively consents to its public disclosure. The district must release the remaining information; however, any information subject to copyright may only be released in accordance with copyright law.

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 <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open-government/members-public/what-expect-after-ruling-issued> or call the OAG's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Public Information Act may be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the OAG, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

Erin Groff
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

EMG/mo

Ref: ID# 929365

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)