



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

December 30, 2004

Mr. Andrew Borrego
Escamilla & Poneck, Inc.
P.O. Box 200
San Antonio, Texas 78291-0200

OR2004-10968

Dear Mr. Borrego:

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# 215878.

The San Marcos Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for several categories of information concerning a named former district employee. You claim that some of the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, and 552.117 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and have reviewed the information you submitted.

Initially, we address your contention that portions of the submitted information are excepted from public disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." This section encompasses information protected by other statutes including section 21.355 of the Education Code. Section 21.355 provides that "[a] document evaluating the performance of a teacher or administrator is confidential." Educ. Code § 21.355. In Open Records Decision No. 643 (1996), this office 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. In that decision, we determined that the word "teacher," for purposes of section 21.355, is a person who is required to and does in fact hold a teaching certificate under subchapter B of chapter 21 of the Education Code or a school district teaching permit under section 21.055 and who is engaged in the process of teaching, as that term is commonly defined, at the time of the evaluation. *See id* at 4. We also concluded that the word "administrator" in 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.* In this instance, you do not inform us and the documents do not indicate that the individual in question was a teacher or an administrator at the time of the evaluations. Therefore, we find that you have failed to establish that section 21.355 is applicable to any of these evaluations, and they may not be withheld on this basis.

Next, we address the applicability of section 552.117 of the Government Code. Section 552.117(a)(1) excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who timely elect to keep this information confidential pursuant to section 552.024. We note, however, that a post office box number is not a "home address" for purposes of section 552.117 and therefore may not be withheld under this exception. *See Gov't Code § 552.117; Open Records Decision No. 622 at 4 (1994)* (legislative history makes clear that purpose of section 552.117 is to protect public employees from being harassed at home) (citing House Committee on State Affairs, Bill Analysis, H.B. 1976, 69th Leg. (1985); Senate Committee on State Affairs, Bill Analysis, H.B. 1976, 69th Leg. (1985)); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 658 at 4 (1998) (statutory confidentiality provision must be express and cannot be implied), 478 at 2 (1987) (language of confidentiality statute controls scope of protection), 465 at 4-5 (1987) (statute explicitly required confidentiality). We also note that information subject to section 552.117(a)(1) may not be withheld from disclosure if the current or former employee made the request for confidentiality under section 552.024 after the request for information at issue was received by the governmental body. Whether a particular piece of information is public must be determined at the time the request for it is made. *See Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989)*. If the employee in question timely elected to keep his personal information confidential, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The district may not withhold this information under section 552.117(a)(1) if the employee did not make a timely election to keep the information confidential. We have marked the information that may be subject to section 552.117.

If a timely election was not made, the social security number may be excepted from public disclosure under section 552.101 in conjunction with the 1990 amendments to the federal Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I). *See Open Records Decision No. 622 (1994)*. These amendments make confidential social security numbers and related records that are obtained and maintained by a state agency or political subdivision of the state pursuant to any provision of law enacted on or after October 1, 1990. *See id.* We have no basis for concluding that the social security number is confidential under section 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I), and therefore excepted from public disclosure under section 552.101 of the Act on the basis of that federal provision. We caution, however, that section 552.352 of the Act imposes criminal penalties for the release of confidential information. Prior to releasing any social security number information, the district should ensure that no such

information was obtained or is maintained by the district pursuant to any provision of law enacted on or after October 1, 1990.

Next, we address the district's privacy arguments for the submitted information. Section 552.102 excepts from disclosure "information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy." Gov't Code § 552.102(a). In *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Texas Newspapers*, 652 S.W.2d 546 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref'd n.r.e.), the court ruled that the test to be applied to information claimed to be protected under section 552.102 is the same as the test formulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation v. Texas Industrial Accident Board*, 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976), for information claimed to be protected under the doctrine of common-law privacy as incorporated by section 552.101 of the Act. Accordingly, we will consider your section 552.101 privacy and section 552.102(a) claims together.

Information is protected from disclosure by the common-law right to privacy when (1) it is highly intimate and embarrassing, such that its release would be highly objectionable to a person of ordinary sensibilities, and (2) there is no legitimate public interest in its disclosure. See 540 S.W.2d at 685. 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. See *id.* at 683. This office has since concluded that other types of information also are protected from disclosure by the common-law right to privacy. See Open Records Decision Nos. 659 at 4-5 (1999) (summarizing information attorney general has determined to be private), 470 at 4 (1987) (illness from severe emotional job-related stress), 455 at 9 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps), 343 at 1-2 (1982) (references in emergency medical records to a drug overdose, acute alcohol intoxication, obstetrical/gynecological illness, convulsions/seizures, or emotional/mental distress). Prior decisions of this office have also 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, e.g., Open Records Decision No. 600 (1992) (information revealing that employee participates in group insurance plan funded partly or wholly by governmental body is not excepted from disclosure).

In addition, this office has found that the following types of information are not excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy: information regarding an individual's profession or business, organizational memberships, or religious affiliation, Open Records Decision No. 674 (2001); job qualifications, including college transcripts, Open Records Decision No. 470 (1987); age, salary, title, and date of employment, Open Records Decision Nos. 455 (1987), 373 (1983); licenses, certificates, and professional awards, Open Records Decision Nos. 444 (1986), 342 (1982); educational background and training, Open Records Decision Nos. 455 (1987), 444 (1986); past work history, Open

Records Decision No. 455 (1987), 444 (1986); names, addresses, and telephone numbers of job references, Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987); performance evaluations, Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987), 400 (1983); and reasons for a public employee's demotion, dismissal, or resignation, Open Records Decision Nos. 444 (1986), 329 (1982), 278 (1981).

Based on your arguments and our review of the submitted information, we find that some of the submitted information is protected by the common-law right to privacy. Accordingly, we conclude that the district must withhold the information that we have marked pursuant to sections 552.101 and 552.102 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law right to privacy. We find, however, that the remaining information at issue is of legitimate public interest and may not be withheld under section 552.101 or 552.102 on the basis of common-law privacy.

In summary, we have marked the information that the district must withhold under section 552.117(a)(1) if a timely election was made. Even if the employee did not make a timely election, the submitted social security number may be confidential under federal law. The district must also withhold the information we have marked under sections 552.101 and 552.102 in conjunction with the common-law right to privacy. The remaining information must be released to the requestor.

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,



L. Joseph James
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LJJ/sdk

Ref: ID# 215878

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Tracy Thomas
Staff Investigator
Professional Discipline Unit
State Board for Educator Certification
P.O. Box 12728
Austin, Texas 78711-2728
(w/o enclosures)