



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

April 10, 2007

Ms. Amanda M. Bigbee
Henslee, Fowler, Hepworth & Schwartz, L.L.P.
306 West 7th Street, Suite 1045
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

OR2007-09035

Dear Ms. Bigbee:

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# 284010.

The Carroll Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for information relating to the district's bidding process and proposed construction at two specified schools, as well as information relating to the job performance of a specified district employee. You claim that parts of the requested information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.107, 552.111, and 552.137 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

We first note that the United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office (the "DOE") recently informed this office that the Family Education 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 consent, unredacted, personally identifiable information contained in education records for the purposes of our review in the open records ruling process under the Act.² Consequently, state and local educational authorities that receive a request for education records from a

¹Although you raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the attorney-client and attorney-work-product privileges, this office has concluded that section 552.101 does not encompass discovery privileges. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 1-2 (2002), 575 at 2 (1990).

²A copy of this letter may be found on the Office of the Attorney General's website: http://www.oag.state.tx.us/opinopen/og_resources.shtml.

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”). Among other things, you have submitted redacted education records for our review. Accordingly, we will consider your arguments against disclosure of the submitted information.³

Section 552.107 of the Government Code protects information within the attorney-client privilege. Gov’t Code § 552.107. 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 “for the purpose of facilitating 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 to whom disclosure is made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client or those reasonably necessary for the transmission of 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, no writ). 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).

³In the future, if the district does obtain parental consent to submit unredacted education records and the district seeks a ruling from this office on the proper redaction of those education records in compliance with FERPA, we will rule accordingly.

In this instance, you explain that the information in Exhibit B constitutes communications made between an attorney acting as legal counsel for the district and the district superintendent. You state that the communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the district and that confidentiality of the communications has been maintained. Based on these representations, and our review, we determine that the district may withhold the information in Exhibit B under section 552.107.⁴

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 a government employee’s work e-mail address because such an address is not that of the employee as a “member of the public” but is instead the address of the individual as a government employee. The e-mail addresses you have marked, and the additional e-mail addresses that we have marked, do not appear to be of a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). You do not inform us that the relevant members of the public have consented to the release of these e-mail addresses. Therefore, the department must withhold the marked e-mail addresses under section 552.137.

In summary, the district may withhold the information in Exhibit B pursuant to section 552.107 of the Government Code. The district must withhold the marked e-mail addresses pursuant to section 552.137. The remaining information must be released.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov’t Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body

⁴As our ruling for this information is dispositive, we do not address your arguments under sections 552.103 and 552.111.


will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Office of the Attorney General at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Kara A. Batey
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KAB/mcf

Ref: ID# 284010

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Kevin F. Lungwitz
Attorney at Law
3005 South Lamar Boulevard, Suite D-109-362
Austin, Texas 78704-4785
(w/o enclosures)