



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 8, 2022

Ms. Mariana G. Evans  
Counsel for Clear Creek Independent School District  
Rogers, Morris & Grover, L.L.P.  
5718 Westheimer, Suite 1200  
Houston, Texas 77057

OR2022-06896

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# 933632.

The Clear Creek Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for e-mails, contracts, and payments pertaining to Curriculum Management Solutions, Inc. ("CMS") during a specified time period.<sup>1</sup> You state the district has released some of the requested information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.111, 552.116, 552.117, and 552.137 of the Government Code. You also release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of CMS. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified CMS of the request for information and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in the Act in certain circumstances). We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> We note the district asked for and received clarification regarding this request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (governmental body may communicate with requestor for purpose of clarifying or narrowing request for information); *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).

<sup>2</sup> 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

Initially, you inform us some of the requested information was the subject of a previous request for information, in response to which this office issued Open Records Letter No. 2021-28236 (2016). In that ruling, we concluded the district may withhold the information at issue under section 552.116 of the Government Code. We have no indication the law, facts, and circumstances on which Open Records Letter No. 2021-28236 was based have changed. Accordingly, the district may continue to rely on Open Records Letter No. 2021-28236 as a previous determination and withhold the previously ruled upon information in accordance with that ruling. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (so long as law, facts, 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).

We note an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received comments from CMS explaining why its information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude CMS has a protected proprietary interest in the submitted information. *See, e.g., id.* § 552.110 (requiring the provision of specific factual evidence demonstrating the applicability of the exception). Accordingly, the district may not withhold any of the information at issue on the basis of any proprietary interest CMS may have in it.

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 [required public disclosure]. If information in an audit working paper is also maintained in another record, that other record is not excepted from [public disclosure] 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

---

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.

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.

*Id.* § 552.116. You assert the submitted information consists of audit working papers prepared or maintained by the district’s administration in conjunction with an audit conducted by the district. You also state, and submit documentation demonstrating, the audit is authorized by an action of the district’s Board of Trustees. Based upon these representations and our review, we agree the information we have marked consists of audit working papers. Accordingly, the district may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.116 of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup> However, we find the district failed to demonstrate any portion of the remaining information constitutes audit working papers. Therefore, the district may not withhold the remaining information at issue under section 552.116 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[.]” *Id.* § 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

---

<sup>3</sup> As our ruling on this information is dispositive, we need not address the remaining argument against its disclosure.

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 assert the remaining information is subject to section 552.111 of the Government Code. Upon review, however, we find the remaining information is general administrative and purely factual information or does not pertain to policymaking. Thus, we find you have failed to establish that any portion of the remaining information at issue constitutes advice, opinions, recommendations, or other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the district. Accordingly, the district may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

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, except as provided by section 552.024(a-1). *See* Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1); *see also id.* § 552.024(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.* Thus, a school 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. 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. Accordingly, if the individual whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, then the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. Conversely, to the extent the individual at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024, the district may not withhold the information at issue 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* Gov’t Code § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail address at issue is not a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). Accordingly, the district must withhold the e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner of the e-mail address affirmatively consents to its disclosure.

In summary, the district may continue to rely on Open Records Letter No. 2021-28236 as a previous determination and withhold the previously ruled upon information in accordance with that ruling. The district may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.116 of the Government Code. If the individual whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, then the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) 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 of the e-mail address affirmatively consents to its disclosure. 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 <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,

Jennifer Copeland  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JC/jxd

Ref: ID# 933632

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Third Party  
(w/o enclosures)