



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

January 16, 2004

Ms. Lynn Rossi Scott
Bracewell & Patterson, L.L.P.
500 North Akard Street, Suite 4000
Dallas, Texas 75201-3387

OR2004-0395

Dear Ms. Scott:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 194656.

The Grand Prairie Independent School District (the "school district") received a request for "copies of Barbosa's Bulletin from August 12, 2003 to October 21, 2003, inclusive." You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.104, 552.105, 552.107(1), 552.111, and 552.114 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

We begin with your privacy claim. You assert that certain information about the death of a teacher's husband is protected from required public disclosure based on the common-law right to privacy. Section 552.101 excepts "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Section 552.101 also encompasses the doctrines of common law and constitutional privacy. Common law privacy protects information if (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Industrial Found. v. Texas Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976), *cert. denied*, 430 U.S. 931 (1977). The type of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. 540 S.W.2d at 683. This office has found that the following types of information are excepted from required public

disclosure under constitutional or common law privacy: some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps), personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545 (1990), information concerning the intimate relations between individuals and their family members, *see* Open Records Decision No. 470 (1987), and identities of victims of sexual abuse, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 440 (1986), 393 (1983), 339 (1982).

In this case, you argue that this office has “recognized that a person’s illness or operations within the past year, as well as physical handicaps are intimate personal information.” However, because “the right of privacy is purely personal,” that right “terminates upon the death of the person whose privacy is invaded.” *Moore v. Charles B. Pierce Film Enters., Inc.*, 589 S.W.2d 489, 491 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1979, writ ref’d n.r.e.); *see also Justice v. Belo Broadcasting Corp.*, 472 F. Supp. 145, 146-47 (N.D. Tex. 1979) (“action for invasion of privacy can be maintained only by a living individual whose privacy is invaded”) (quoting Restatement of Torts 2d); *See* Attorney General Opinions JM-229 (1984) (“the right of privacy lapses upon death”), H-917 (1976) (“We are . . . of the opinion that the Texas courts would follow the almost uniform rule of other jurisdictions that the right of privacy lapses upon death.”); Open Records Decision No. 272 (1981) (“the right of privacy is personal and lapses upon death”). We therefore find that the school district may not withhold the information based on the common-law right to privacy.

You seek to protect from disclosure information that identifies a school district student based on sections 552.101 and 552.114 of the Government Code as well as the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 (“FERPA”). FERPA provides that no federal funds will be made available under any applicable program to an educational agency or institution that releases personally identifiable information (other than directory information) contained in a student’s education records to anyone but certain enumerated federal, state, and local officials and institutions, unless otherwise authorized by the student’s parent. *See* 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(b)(1). “Education records” means those records that contain information directly related to a student and are maintained by an educational agency or institution or by a person acting for such agency or institution. *Id.* § 1232g(a)(4)(A). This office generally applies the same analysis under section 552.114 and FERPA. Open Records Decision No. 539 (1990).

Section 552.114 excepts from disclosure student records at an educational institution funded completely or in part by state revenue. Section 552.026 provides as follows:

This chapter does not require the release of information contained in education records of an educational agency or institution, except in conformity with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974, Sec. 513, Pub. L. No. 93-380, 20 U.S.C. Sec. 1232g.

In Open Records Decision No. 634 (1995), this office concluded that (1) an educational agency or institution may withhold from public disclosure information that is protected by FERPA and excepted from required public disclosure by sections 552.026 and 552.101 without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision as to those exceptions, and (2) an educational agency or institution that is state-funded may withhold from public disclosure information that is excepted from required public disclosure by section 552.114 as a "student record," insofar as the "student record" is protected by FERPA, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision as to that exception. Information must be withheld from required public disclosure under FERPA only to the extent "reasonable and necessary to avoid personally identifying a particular student." See Open Records Decision Nos. 332 (1982), 206 (1978).

The information contains a student name, which you state the school district will redact pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 634. You ask that this office determine that the "entire discussion" about the student is subject to FERPA "because it appears that [the student name] can still be determined by the accompanying explanation of the circumstances surrounding the student[.]" Thus, the question is whether the entire discussion is personally identifying as to a particular student so as to bring it within the restrictions of FERPA.

The regulations issued under FERPA, define personally identifiable as follows:

the data or information includes (a) the name of a student, the student's parent or other family member, (b) the address of the student, (c) a personal identifier, such as the student's social security number or student number, (d) a list of personal characteristics which would make the student's identity easily traceable, or (e) other information which would make the student's identity easily traceable.

34 C.F.R. § 99.3. Items (a), (b), and (c) are not relevant since they are not included in the discussion information at issue. The standard established in items (d) and (e) is whether the information "would make the student's identity easily traceable." *Id.* This office has determined that in certain circumstances, some information relating to student records, while not identifying individual students by name, may be withheld because of the relatively small number of students to which the information could be applicable. See Open Records Decision No. 294 (1981).

In this case, the school district has not explained how the disclosure of the discussion information would make the student's identity easily traceable. Therefore, without additional information, this office cannot determine that the discussion information is personally identifying as to the student. Accordingly, the discussion information may not be withheld from disclosure under FERPA. For further guidance on this question, we suggest that you consult with the Family Policy Compliance Office of the United States Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202-0498.

We now turn to your section 552.103 claim. Section 552.103 provides as follows:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

....

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

The school district has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *University of Tex. Law Sch. v. Texas Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, no pet.); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). The school district must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under 552.103(a).

To establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office "concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture." Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Concrete evidence to support a claim that litigation is reasonably anticipated may include, for example, the governmental body's receipt of a letter containing a specific threat to sue the governmental body from an attorney for a potential opposing party.¹ Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be "realistically contemplated"). On the other hand, this office has determined that if an individual publicly threatens to bring suit against a governmental body, but does not actually take objective steps toward filing suit, litigation is not reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982). Further, the fact that a potential opposing party has hired an attorney who makes a request for

¹In addition, this office has concluded that litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party took the following objective steps toward litigation: filed a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, *see* Open Records Decision No. 336 (1982); hired an attorney who made a demand for disputed payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, *see* Open Records Decision No. 346 (1982); and threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney, *see* Open Records Decision No. 288 (1981).

information does not establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated. Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).

In this case, you claim that portions of the information relate to pending litigation to which the school district is a party and portions of the information relate to reasonably anticipated litigation. We find that the school district has shown that portions of the information relate to pending litigation. We therefore agree that section 552.103 applies to the information that relates to the pending litigation. With regard to your claim that portions of the information relate to reasonably anticipated litigation, you state that the school district anticipates litigation because a teacher has filed a grievance with the school district and because the district's policies require bringing a grievance before filing a lawsuit. You also inform us that the grieving teacher has requested information related to the teacher's complaint. We find that the school district has not established that litigation with regard to the teacher's grievance is reasonably anticipated. Accordingly, the school district may not withhold the information about the teacher's grievance based on section 552.103.

You raise section 552.104 for portions of the information. Section 552.104 excepts from disclosure "information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder." The purpose of section 552.104 is to protect a governmental body's interests in competitive bidding situations. *See* Open Records Decision No. 592 (1991). Moreover, section 552.104 requires a showing of some actual or specific harm in a particular competitive situation; a general allegation that a competitor will gain an unfair advantage will not suffice. Open Records Decision No. 541 at 4 (1990). Section 552.104 does not except information relating to competitive bidding situations once a contract has been awarded. Open Records Decision Nos. 306 (1982), 184 (1978).

You state that the requested information references two competitive situations. First, you state that one situation involves a collaborative effort between the school district and a health services provider. However, you have not shown that a competitor exists in this situation. We therefore find that the school district has not established the applicability of section 552.104 to the information about the collaborative effort with the health services provider. *See* Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982) (exception inapplicable where only one developer is seeking contracts so that there are no "competitors" who could gain an advantage from the release of this information).

As for the security equipment proposal, the information indicates that there is a competitive situation ongoing at this time. However, we find that you have not shown the specific harm that will result from the release of this information or otherwise shown how the release of the information would give an unfair advantage to a competitor. *See* Open Records Decision No. 541 (1990). Accordingly, the school district may not withhold the information from the requestor based on section 552.104.

Section 552.105 excepts from disclosure information relating to:

- (1) the location of real or personal property for a public purpose prior to public announcement of the project; or
- (2) appraisals or purchase price of real or personal property for a public purpose prior to the formal award of contracts for the property.

Section 552.105 was designed to protect a governmental body's planning and negotiating position with respect to particular transactions. Open Records Decision No. 564 at 2 (1990). This exception protects information relating to the location, appraisals, and purchase price of property only until the transaction is either completed or aborted. Open Records Decision Nos. 357 at 3 (1982), 310 at 2 (1982).

You argue that section 552.105 applies to information that identifies the location and financial arrangement for the sale of school district real property prior to the announcement of the project and prior to the award of contract for the property. You also argue that this exception applies to information that reveals the proposed location and financial arrangements for the collaborative effort the school district is negotiating for a health services provider to use school district property. We agree that section 552.105 applies to the location and financial arrangements for both projects. Thus, the school district may withhold this information under section 552.105 until the transactions are either completed or aborted. *See id.*

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 "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 Texas 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)(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).

Based on your representations and our review, we agree that section 552.107(1) applies to portions of the information. We have marked the information accordingly.

Finally, we consider your section 552.111 claim. Section 552.111 excepts from disclosure “an interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency.” In Open Records Decision No. 615 (1993), this office reexamined the predecessor to the section 552.111 exception in light of the decision in *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ), and held that section 552.111 excepts only those internal communications consisting of advice, recommendations, opinions, and other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the governmental body. *City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351, 364 (Tex. 2000); *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Texas Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.). An agency’s policymaking functions do not encompass internal administrative or personnel matters; disclosure of information relating to such matters will not inhibit free discussion among agency personnel as to policy issues. ORD 615 at 5-6. Additionally, section 552.111 does not generally except from disclosure purely factual information that is severable from the opinion portions of internal memoranda. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 37 S.W.3d at 160; ORD 615 at 4-5. Based on your representations and our review of the information, we agree that section 552.111 applies to portions of the information. We have marked the documents accordingly.

In summary, for the reasons stated above, the school district may withhold marked portions of the records based on sections 552.103, 552.105, 552.107(1), and 552.111. While the school district must withhold the student name based on FERPA, this office cannot determine that the discussion information is personally identifying as to the student so as to be protected from disclosure under federal law and so, the discussion information may not be withheld from disclosure under FERPA. The school district may not withhold any portion of the information based on section 552.101 in conjunction with the common-law right to privacy or based on section 552.104. The school district must release the remaining information.

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, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, 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 Texas Building and Procurement Commission 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. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code

§ 552.325. 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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kay Hastings", written in a cursive style.

Kay Hastings
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KH/seg

Ref: ID# 194656

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Ms. Jennifer Arend
1000 Avenue H East
Arlington, Texas 76011
(w/o enclosures)