



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

August 11, 2014

Ms. Sarah W. Langlois  
Counsel for Harris County Department of Education  
Rogers, Morris & Grover, L.L.P.  
5718 Westheimer Road, Suite 1200  
Houston, Texas 77057

OR2014-13949

Dear Ms. Langlois:

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# 532332.

The Harris County Department of Education (the "department"), which you represent, received a request for all e-mails sent or received by a named employee of the department during a specified period of time. You state the department will release some of the requested information. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, 552.111, and 552.136 of the Government Code. Additionally, you state release of some of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of the College Station Independent School District and the WALIPP-TSU Academy. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified the third parties of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information at issue 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>1</sup> We note the information we have marked is not responsive to the instant request for information because it does not consist of an e-mail sent or received by the named employee.

---

<sup>1</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 letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

This ruling does not address the public availability of non-responsive information, and the department is not required to release non-responsive information in response to this request.

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 either of the third parties explaining why the information at issue should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude either of the third parties has a protected proprietary interest in the information at issue. *See id.* § 552.110; Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case information is trade secret), 542 at 3. Accordingly, the department may not withhold the information at issue on the basis of any proprietary interest the third parties may have in the information.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information that comes 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate 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. *See* 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. *See 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, lawyer representatives, and a lawyer representing another party in a pending action and concerning a matter of common interest therein. *See* 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 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. *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).

You claim the information you have marked is protected by section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. You state the information at issue consists of communications involving an attorney for the department and officials and employees of the department. You state the communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the department and these communications have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Thus, the department may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup>

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 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,

---

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

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.

You state the information you have marked consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations relating to the department's policy. You also state the information you marked contains draft documents. You explain the draft documents have been released or will be released to the public in final form. Based on your representations and our review, we find the department may withhold the information we have marked and the draft documents you have marked under section 552.111.<sup>3</sup> However, we find the remaining information at issue consists of either general administrative information that does not relate to policymaking or information that is purely factual in nature. Thus, we find you have failed to demonstrate how the remaining information at issue is excepted under section 552.111. Accordingly, the remaining information at issue may not be withheld under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

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 of the Government Code encompasses section 21.355 of the Education Code. Section 21.355(a) provides that "[a] document evaluating the performance of a teacher or administrator is confidential." Educ. Code § 21.355(a). This office has interpreted section 21.355 to apply to any document that evaluates, as that term is commonly understood, the performance of a teacher or an administrator. *See* Open Records Decision No. 643 (1996). We have determined that "administrator," for purposes of section 21.355, means a person who is required to and does in fact hold an administrator's certificate under subchapter B of chapter 21 of the Education Code and is performing the functions of an administrator, as that term is commonly defined, at the time of the evaluation. *Id.*

The department contends the remaining information you have marked relates to evaluations of a certified administrator. The department states the administrator at issue was acting in

---

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

his capacity as an administrator when the information at issue was created. Upon review, we find the department has failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information you have marked is subject to section 21.355 of the Education Code; thus, the department may not withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

We understand the department has redacted information subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code as permitted by section 552.024(c) of the Government Code.<sup>4</sup> However, we note some of the remaining information may also be subject to section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. Section 552.117(a)(1) 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). We note section 552.117 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). 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. Information may not be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee or official who did not timely request under section 552.024 the information be kept confidential. We have marked the cellular telephone number of a department employee. Therefore, if the employee at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code and a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service, the department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. Conversely, if the employee at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024 or a governmental body pays for the cellular telephone service, the department may not withhold the marked information under section 552.117(a)(1).

Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides, "[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], 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." Gov't Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining "access device"). Upon review, we find the department has failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information is subject to section 552.136; thus, the department may not withhold any of the remaining information on that basis.

---

<sup>4</sup>Section 552.024(c)(2) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact information protected by section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code without the necessity of requesting a decision under the Act if the current or former employee or official to whom the information pertains timely chooses not to allow public access to the information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.024(c)(2).

We note some of the remaining information is subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code, which 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).<sup>5</sup> See Gov’t Code § 552.137(a)-(c). Upon review, we find the department must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure.

In summary, the department may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code and the information we have marked in addition to the draft documents you have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The department must withhold the cellular telephone number we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code if the employee at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code and a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service. The department must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure. The department 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 [http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl\\_ruling\\_info.shtml](http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml), or call the Office of the Attorney General’s Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



David L. Wheelus  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

DLW/ds

---

<sup>5</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body. See Open Records Decision No. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

Ms. Sarah W. Langlois - Page 7

Ref: ID# 532332

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)