



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 18, 2022

Mr. David Holmes  
Counsel for the Manor Independent School District  
Walsh Gallegos Trevino Kyle & Robinson P.C.  
P.O. Box 2156  
Austin, Texas 78768-2156

OR2022-36098

Dear Mr. Holmes:

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# 985541.

The Manor Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for specified communications related to election applications and certain surveillance video. 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. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.<sup>1</sup>

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This exception encompasses information other statutes make confidential. You claim section 552.101 in conjunction with section 418.182 of the Government Code, which was added to chapter 418 of the Government Code as part of the Texas Homeland Security Act (the "HSA"). Section 418.182 provides in part:

- (a) Except as provided by Subsections (b) and (c), information, including access codes and passwords, in the possession of a governmental entity that relates to the specifications, operating procedures, or location of a security system used to protect public or private property from an act of terrorism or

---

<sup>1</sup> We note you have not submitted the requested surveillance video recording for our review. Although in this instance we can determine the extent to which this fungible information may be excepted from disclosure, we advise the district in the future to submit for review the information that it seeks to protect from disclosure and for which it seeks a ruling from this office. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302.

related criminal activity is confidential.

*Id.* § 418.182(a). The fact that information may generally be related to a security system does not make the information *per se* confidential under section 418.182. *See* Open Records Decision No. 649 at 3 (1996) (language of confidentiality provision controls scope of its protection). Furthermore, the mere recitation by a governmental body of a statute's key terms is not sufficient to demonstrate the applicability of a claimed provision. As with any confidentiality provision, a governmental body asserting section 418.182 must adequately explain how the responsive information falls within the scope of the statute. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must explain how claimed exception to disclosure applies).

You state the information at issue consists of video recordings from security cameras that are located at a district middle school. You state the requested information reveals the location, video quality, clarity, camera angles, and coverage of the security cameras. You state the security cameras are part of a security system used to protect public and private property from acts of terrorism or related criminal activity. Based on your representations, we conclude the requested surveillance camera footage is related to the specifications, operating procedures, or location of a security system used to protect public property from an act of terrorism or related criminal activity. *See Tex. Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Abbott*, 310 S.W.3d 670 (Tex. App.—Austin 2010, no pet.) (recorded images necessarily relate to specifications of security system that recorded them, and thus, are confidential under section 418.182). Accordingly, the district must withhold the requested video recording under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.182(a) of the Government Code.

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). 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. *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 the information at issue contains confidential communications including attorneys for the district, district officials, and district employees for the facilitation of legal services. You state the communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find the information we have marked consists of privileged attorney-client communications. Therefore, the district may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> However, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue constitutes communications between privileged parties made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the district for the purposes of section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. Consequently, the district may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.107 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

---

<sup>2</sup> As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

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 assert the remaining information is subject to section 552.111 of the Government Code. Upon review, we find the remaining information is general administrative and purely factual information that does not rise to the level of policymaking or has been shared with an individual with whom the district has not demonstrated it shares a privity of interest or common deliberative process with respect to the policymaking matters at issue. Thus, we find you have failed to demonstrate the information at issue constitutes internal communications containing advice, recommendations, or opinions reflecting the policymaking processes of the district. Therefore, 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.

We note some of the remaining information is subject to section 1.012 of the Election Code, which provides, in part, as follows:

(a) Subject to Subsection (b), an election record that is public information shall be made available to the public during the regular business hours of the record's custodian.

...

(c) Except as otherwise provided by this code or [the Act], all election records are public information.

(d) In this code, "election record" includes:

(1) anything distributed or received by government under this code;

...

(3) a certificate, application, notice, report, or other document or paper issued or received by government under this code.

Elec. Code § 1.012(a), (c), (d)(1), (d)(3). Section 141.035 of the Election Code also provides, "[a]n application for a place on [an election] ballot . . . is public information immediately on its filing." *Id.* § 141.035. Thus, under section 1.012(a), this information constitutes "election records" and the district must make it available to the public, except

as provided by the Act. Accordingly, we will address your arguments against disclosure of the submitted election records.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). Under the common-law right of privacy, an individual has a right to be free from the publicizing of private affairs in which the public has no legitimate concern. *Id.* at 682. The Third Court of Appeals has concluded public citizens' dates of birth are protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *See Paxton v. City of Dallas*, No. 03-13-00546-CV, 2015 WL 3394061, at \*3 (Tex. App.—Austin May 22, 2015, pet. denied) (mem. op.). Thus, the district must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

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); Open Records Decision No. 622 (1994). However, section 552.117 applies only to records that a governmental body holds in an employment capacity. *See Open Record Decision Nos.* 532 (1989) (purpose of predecessor to section 552.117 is to protect certain information during and after employment relationship), 530 (1989) (discussing interplay between sections 552.024 and 552.117), 455 (1987). The information at issue constitutes election records the district maintains in accordance with the Election Code, and not in an employment capacity. Thus, the district may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code.

We note some of the submitted election records may be subject to section 552.1175 of the Government Code, which provides, in part:

(a) This section applies only to:

...

(17) an elected public officer[.]

(b) Information that relates to the home address, home telephone number, emergency contact information, date of birth, or social security number of an individual to whom this section applies, or that reveals whether the individual has family members is confidential and may not be disclosed to the public under this chapter if the individual to whom the information relates:

(1) chooses to restrict public access to the information; and

(2) notifies the governmental body of the individual's choice on a form provided by the governmental body, accompanied by evidence of the individual's status.

Gov't Code § 552.1175(a)(17), (b).<sup>3</sup> We note section 552.1175 is also applicable to personal cellular telephone numbers, provided the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-6 (1988) (section 552.117 not applicable to cellular telephone numbers paid for by governmental body and intended for official use). Accordingly, to the extent the remaining information in the election records consists of the home address; the home telephone number; or the cellular telephone number of an elected public officer, the district must withhold such information under section 552.1175 of the Government Code if the elected public officer to whom the information pertains elects to restrict access to the information in accordance with section 552.1175(b); however, the district may withhold the cellular telephone numbers at issue only if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service. If the individual to whom the information relates is not an elected public officer or does not make an election under section 552.1175(b), then the district may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.1175.

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). Section 552.137 does not apply to an institutional e-mail address, the general e-mail address of a business, an e-mail address of a person who has a contractual relationship with a governmental body, an e-mail address of a vendor who seeks to contract with a governmental body, an e-mail address maintained by a governmental entity for one of its officials or employees, or an e-mail address provided to a governmental body on a letterhead. *See id.* § 552.137(c). We are unable to determine whether some of the personal e-mail addresses at issue, which are located within e-mails communicating official business of the district, belong to district officials or employees. Thus, we rule conditionally. To the extent the e-mail addresses within the remaining information are the personal e-mail addresses of district employees, or to the extent subsection (c) applies, this information is not subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code and may not be withheld on that basis. *See Austin Bulldog v. Leffingwell*, 490 S.W.3d 240 (Tex. App.—Austin 2016, no pet.) (holding personal e-mail addresses of government officials used to conduct official government business are not e-mail addresses of “members of the public” for purposes of Gov't Code § 552.137(a)). However, to the extent the e-mail addresses within the remaining information are not the personal e-mail addresses of district employees and subsection (c) does not apply, this information is subject to section 552.137 and must be withheld under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners of the e-mail addresses affirmatively consent to their release.

---

<sup>3</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 Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

In summary, the district must withhold the requested video recording under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.182(a) of the Government Code. The district may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The district must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. If the individuals whose information is at issue are an elected public officer and elect to restrict access to the information at issue in accordance with section 552.1175(b) of the Government Code, then the district must withhold that individual's home address, the home telephone number, and the cellular telephone number in the election records under section 552.1175 of the Government Code; however, the district may withhold the cellular telephone numbers at issue only if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service. To the extent the e-mail addresses within the remaining information are not the personal e-mail addresses of district employees and subsection (c) does not apply, this information is subject to section 552.137 and must be withheld 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 <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,

Kelly McWethy  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

KM/mo

Ref: ID# 985541

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)