



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

January 28, 2008

Ms. Erica Escobar  
Bracewell & Giuliani LLP  
800 One Alamo Center  
106 South St. Mary's Street  
San Antonio, Texas 78205-3603

Ms. Susan K. Bohn  
General Counsel  
Lake Travis Independent School District  
3322 Ranch Road 620 South  
Austin, Texas 78738

OR2008-01173

Dear Ms. Escobar and Ms. Bohn:

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# 300609.

The Lake Travis Independent School District (the "district") received several requests for information from the same requestor, including information related to named individuals. You state that some of the requested information has been provided to the requestor.<sup>1</sup> You also state that the district sought and received clarifications of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request). We note that you have redacted social security numbers

---

<sup>1</sup>The district states that it received twenty-two requests for information on November 1, 2007 and three requests for information on December 4, 2007. However, we note that the district has only provided to this office nine of the twenty-two requests for information from the November 1, 2007 date and one of the three requests for information from the December 4, 2007 date. To the extent any additional responsive information existed on the dates the district received these requests, we assume you have released it. If you have not released any such records, you must do so at this time. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301(a), .302; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (if governmental body concludes that no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible).

pursuant to section 552.147 of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.103, 552.107, 552.111, 552.117, 552.130, 552.136, and 552.137 of the Government Code, and privileged under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5 and Texas Rule of Evidence 503.<sup>3</sup> We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information. We have also considered comments submitted by one of the named individual s' attorney. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested third party may submit comments explaining why submitted information should or should not be released).

Initially, you note that some of the submitted information, which you have marked, is not responsive to the present request. *See* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 3 (1986) (governmental body not required to disclose information that did not exist at the time request was received). This ruling does not address the public availability of information that is not responsive to the request, and the district need not release such information in response to the request.

Next, we note that the United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office informed this office that the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), 20 U.S.C. § 1232(a), 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 purpose of our review in the open records ruling process under the Act.<sup>4</sup> Consequently, state and local educational authorities that receive a request for education records from a 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"). Determinations under FERPA must be made by the educational authority in possession of the education records.<sup>5</sup> Among other things, you have submitted education records that you have redacted pursuant to FERPA for our review. However, some of the submitted education records still contain student information. Because our office is prohibited from reviewing these education records to determine whether appropriate redactions under FERPA have been made, we will not address the applicability of FERPA

---

<sup>2</sup>Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office under the Act. Gov't Code § 552.147.

<sup>3</sup>Although you raise section 552.105 of the Government Code, you have not submitted arguments explaining how this exception applies to the submitted information. Therefore, we presume you have withdrawn this exception. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302.

<sup>4</sup>A 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](http://www.oag.state.tx.us/opinopen/og_resources.shtml).

<sup>5</sup>In 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.

to any of the submitted records. We will, however, address the applicability of your claimed exceptions to the submitted information.

We also note that you have redacted e-mail addresses from the submitted documents. You do not assert, nor does our review of our records indicate, that the district has been authorized to withhold any such information without seeking a ruling from this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(a); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2000). Because we can discern the nature of the information that has been redacted, being deprived of this information does not inhibit our ability to make a ruling in this instance. Nevertheless, be advised that a failure to provide this office with requested information generally deprives us of the ability to determine whether information may be withheld and leaves this office with no alternative other than ordering that the redacted information be released. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body must provide this office with copy of "specific information requested"), .302.

We further note that a portion of the submitted information consists of attorney fee bills that are subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a)(16) provides for the required public disclosure of "information that is in a bill for attorney's fees and that is not privileged under the attorney-client privilege," unless the information is expressly confidential under other law. *Id.* § 552.022(a)(16). Although you seek to withhold information contained in the attorney fee bills under sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code, these sections are discretionary exceptions to disclosure that protect a governmental body's interests and may be waived. *See id.* § 552.007; *Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 10-11 (2002) (attorney-client privilege under section 552.107(1) may be waived), 677 at 10 (2002) (attorney work product privilege under section 552.111 may be waived); 665 at 2 n.5 (2002)(discretionary exceptions generally). As such, sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 are not other laws that make information confidential for the purposes of section 552.022(a)(16). Therefore, the district may not withhold any of the information that is subject to section 552.022 under section 552.103, 552.107, or 552.111.

The Texas Supreme Court has held, however, that the Texas Rules of Evidence and the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure are "other law" within the meaning of section 552.022. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). The attorney-client privilege also is found at Texas Rule of Evidence 503, and the attorney work product privilege also is found at Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5. Accordingly, we will consider your assertion of these privileges under rule 503 and rule 192.5 with respect to the information in the attorney fee bills.

Texas Rule of Evidence 503 enacts the attorney-client privilege. Rule 503(b)(1) provides as follows:

A client has a privilege to refuse to disclose and to prevent any other person from disclosing confidential communications made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the client:

- (A) between the client or a representative of the client and the client's lawyer or a representative of the lawyer;
- (B) between the lawyer and the lawyer's representative;
- (C) by the client or a representative of the client, or the client's lawyer or a representative of the lawyer, to a lawyer or a representative of a lawyer representing another party in a pending action and concerning a matter of common interest therein;
- (D) between representatives of the client or between the client and a representative of the client; or
- (E) among lawyers and their representatives representing the same client.

TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). A communication is "confidential" if 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).

Thus, in order to withhold attorney-client privileged information from disclosure under rule 503, a governmental body must: (1) show that the document is a communication transmitted between privileged parties or reveals a confidential communication; (2) identify the parties involved in the communication; and (3) show that the communication is confidential by explaining that it was not intended to be disclosed to third persons and that it was made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client. Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the information is privileged and confidential under rule 503, provided the client has not waived the privilege or the document does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in rule 503(d). *Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, no writ).

You state that the submitted attorney fee bills document communications between the district's attorneys and their clients that were made in connection with the rendition of professional legal services to the district. You also state that the communications were intended to be and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we have marked the information that the district may withhold on the basis of the attorney-client privilege under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. However, the district has failed to demonstrate how any of the remaining information constitutes confidential communications between privileged parties made for the purpose of

facilitating the rendition of professional legal services. Accordingly, none of the remaining information may be withheld on that basis.

Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5 encompasses the attorney work product privilege. For purposes of section 552.022 of the Government Code, information is confidential under rule 192.5 only to the extent that the information implicates the core work product aspect of the work product privilege. *See* Open Records Decision No. 677 at 9-10 (2002). Rule 192.5 defines core work product as the work product of an attorney or an attorney's representative, developed in anticipation of litigation or for trial, that contains the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of the attorney or the attorney's representative. *See* TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5(a), (b)(1). Accordingly, in order to withhold attorney core work product from disclosure under rule 192.5, a governmental body must demonstrate that the material was (1) created for trial or in anticipation of litigation and (2) consists of the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of an attorney or an attorney's representative. *Id.*

The first prong of the work product test, which requires a governmental body to show that the information at issue was created in anticipation of litigation, has two parts. A governmental body must demonstrate that (1) a reasonable person would have concluded from the totality of the circumstances surrounding the investigation that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue, and (2) the party resisting discovery believed in good faith that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue and conducted the investigation for the purpose of preparing for such litigation. *See Nat'l Tank v. Brotherton*, 851 S.W.2d 193, 207 (Tex. 1993). A "substantial chance" of litigation does not mean a statistical probability, but rather "that litigation is more than merely an abstract possibility or unwarranted fear." *Id.* at 204. The second part of the work product test requires the governmental body to show that the materials at issue contain the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of an attorney's or an attorney's representative. *See* TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5(b)(1). A document containing core work product information that meets both parts of the work product test is confidential under rule 192.5, provided that the information does not fall within the scope of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in rule 192.5(c). *See Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, no writ).

You contend that the attorney fee bills contain core attorney work product that is protected by rule 192.5. Having considered your arguments and reviewed the remaining information, we conclude that you have not demonstrated that any of the remaining information consists of core work product for purposes of Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5. Accordingly, the district may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under rule 192.5.

We now address your arguments for the information that is not subject to section 552.022. 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. Section 552.101 encompasses information protected by federal law. The submitted information contains an I-9 form (Employment Eligibility Verification), which is

governed by section 1324a of title 8 of the United States Code. This section provides that an I-9 form and "any information contained in or appended to such form, may not be used for purposes other than for enforcement of this chapter" and for enforcement of other federal statutes governing crime and criminal investigations. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1324a(b)(5); *see also* 8 C.F.R. § 274a.2(b)(4). Release of the form in this instance would be "for purposes other than for enforcement" of the referenced federal statutes. Accordingly, we conclude that the I-9 form, which we have marked, is confidential and may only be released in compliance with the federal laws and regulations governing the employment verification system.

Section 552.101 also encompasses section 21.355 of the Education Code, which provides, "a document evaluating the performance of a teacher or administrator is confidential." Educ. Code § 21.355. In Open Records Decision No. 643, this office has interpreted this section to apply to any document that evaluates, as that term is commonly understood, the performance of a teacher or administrator. Open Records Decision No. 643 (1996). In that opinion, this office also determined that a teacher is someone who is required to hold and does hold a certificate or permit required under chapter 21 of the Education Code and is teaching at the time of the evaluation. *Id.* Similarly, an administrator is someone who is required to hold and does hold a certificate required under chapter 21 of the Education Code and is serving as an administrator at the time of the evaluation. *Id.* You inform us that the individual at issue is an administrator who holds a Texas Educator Certificate under chapter 21 of the Texas Education Code. Based upon your representations and our review, we have marked the information that falls within the scope of section 21.355 and must be withheld on that basis.

Section 552.101 also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. Common-law privacy protects information that (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) is not of legitimate concern to the public. *See Industrial Found. v. Texas Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976), *cert. denied*, 430 U.S. 931 (1977). This office has found that some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses are excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps).

In addition, this office has found that financial information relating only to an individual ordinarily satisfies the first requirement of the test for common-law privacy, but that there is a legitimate public interest in the essential facts about a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992) (finding personal financial information to include designation of beneficiary of employee's retirement benefits and optional insurance coverage; choice of particular insurance carrier; direct deposit authorization; and forms allowing employee to allocate pretax compensation to group insurance, health care, or dependent care), 545 at 4 (1990) (attorney general has found kinds of financial information not excepted from public disclosure by common-law privacy to generally be those regarding receipt of governmental funds or debts owed to governmental entities). The district asserts that some of the submitted information is made confidential by

common-law privacy. It also explains that the district only contributes financially to a group medical insurance plan for its employees and that employees may elect to enroll in other types of insurance and annuities. Upon review, we agree that some of the submitted information is private. The district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, no part of the remaining information for which the district asserts common-law privacy may be withheld on this basis.

You claim that the marked portions of the employees' submitted transcripts are excepted under section 552.102(b) of the Government Code. Section 552.102(b) excepts from disclosure all information from transcripts of professional public school employees other than the employee's name, the courses taken, and the degree obtained. Gov't Code § 552.102(b); Open Records Decision No. 526 (1989). Thus, with the exception of the employee's name, courses taken, and degree obtained, which you must release, we find that the submitted transcripts must be withheld pursuant to section 552.102(b).

Section 552.107 of the Government Code protects information coming 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. ORD 676 at 6-7.

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)-(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).

You state that some of the remaining information consists of confidential attorney-client communications between the district's attorneys and employees of the district. Further, you explain that these communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the district. You assert that the communications were intended to be and have remained confidential. Based on these representations and our review, we conclude that the district may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.107.

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the current and former home addresses, telephone numbers, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). Additionally, section 552.117 also encompasses personal cellular telephone and pager numbers, provided that the cellular phone service is paid for by the employee with his or her own funds. *See Open Records Decision No. 670 at 6 (2001)* (extending section 552.117(a)(1) exception to personal cellular phone number and personal pager number of employee who elects to withhold home phone number in accordance with section 552.024). Whether a particular piece of information is protected under section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time the request for it is made. *See Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989)*. You state that the employees at issue elected to keep their information confidential prior to the district's receipt of the current request for information. Therefore, the district must withhold the information that you have marked, as well as the information we have marked, under section 552.117.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information that "relates to . . . a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license or permit issued by an agency of this state [or] a motor vehicle title or registration issued by an agency of this state." Gov't Code § 552.130. The district must withhold the Texas motor vehicle information we have marked pursuant to section 552.130.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code states that "[n]otwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential." *Id.* § 552.136. The district must withhold the credit card, bank account, and routing numbers that it has marked, as well as the information we have marked, pursuant to section 552.136.

Section 552.137 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 id.* § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail addresses contained in the submitted information, which we have marked, are not the type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). Therefore, unless the individuals whose e-mail addresses are at issue consented to release of their e-mail addresses, the district must withhold them in accordance with section 552.137.

In summary, the district may withhold the information in the attorney fee bills that we have marked under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. The district must withhold the I-9 form, which we have marked, under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 1324a of title 8 of the United States Code; the information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education Code; the information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy; and the information subject to section 552.102(b). The district may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.107. The district must also withhold the information it has marked, as well as the information we have marked, under section 552.117; the information we have marked under section 552.130; the information it has marked, as well as the information we have marked, under section 552.136; and the information we have marked under 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 file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, 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 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 challenge 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,



Loan Hong-Turney  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

LH/eeg

Ref: ID# 300609

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. David Lovelace  
103 Galaxy  
Austin, Texas 78734  
(w/o enclosures)