



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

December 11, 2007

Mr. Wayne D. Haglund
Law Office of Wayne D. Haglund, P.C.
P.O. Box 713
Lufkin, Texas 75902-0713

OR2007-16303

Dear Mr. Haglund:

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# 297208.

The Livingston Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a former employee of the district. You state that some of the requested information has been provided to the requestor, but claim that some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.103, 552.108, 552.111, 552.117, and 552.130 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.²

The United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office has 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,

¹Although you raise section 552.024 of the Government Code, we note that this section is not an exception to public disclosure under the Act. Rather, this section permits a current or former official or employee of a governmental body to choose whether to allow public access to certain information relating to the current or former official or employee that is held by the employing governmental body. *See* Gov't Code § 552.024. Section 552.117 is instead the proper exception to assert.

²We note that the submitted information contains social security numbers. 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.

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.³ 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”). You have submitted, among other things, unredacted education records for our review. 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 to any of the submitted records. Such determinations under FERPA must be made by the educational authority in possession of the education records.⁴ We will, however, address the applicability of the remaining claimed exceptions to the submitted information.

We must next address the district’s obligations under section 552.301 of the Government Code, which prescribes the procedures that a governmental body must follow in asking this office to decide whether requested information is excepted from public disclosure. Pursuant to section 552.301(b), a governmental body must ask for a decision from this office and state the exceptions that apply within ten business days of receiving the written request. The district received the request for information on September 19, 2007, but did not request a decision from this office until October 8, 2007. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.301(b). Thus, the district failed to comply with the procedural requirements mandated by section 552.301.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body’s failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless the governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.302; *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). A compelling reason exists when third-party interests are at stake or when information is confidential under other law. Open Records Decision No. 150 (1977). Sections 552.103, 552.108, and 552.111 of the Government Code are discretionary in nature; they serve only to protect a governmental body’s interests and may be waived. As such, they do not constitute compelling reasons to withhold information. *See 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. 677 at 10 (2002) (governmental body may

³A 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.

⁴In 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. We also note that the requestor represents an educational authority.

waive section 552.111), 473 (1987) (statutory predecessor to section 552.111 may be waived), 177 (1977) (governmental body may waive statutory predecessor to section 552.108); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 522 (1989) (discretionary exceptions in general). By failing to comply with section 552.301, the district has waived the discretionary exceptions you raised. However, the need of another governmental body to withhold information under section 552.108 can provide a compelling reason under section 552.302. *See* Open Records Decision 586 at 3 (1991). Because the district asserts section 552.108 on behalf of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (the "FBI"), we will address your claim under this exception. Sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.117, and 552.130 of the Government Code can also provide compelling reasons to overcome this presumption; therefore, we will address your claims under these exceptions as well.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code 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. Section 21.355 of the Education Code provides that "[a] document evaluating the performance of a teacher or administrator is confidential." 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 643 (1996). In Open Records Decision No. 643, we determined that a "teacher" for purposes of section 21.355 means a person who (1) 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 (2) is engaged in the process of teaching, as that term is commonly defined, at the time of the evaluation. *See id.* at 4. On review of the information, we agree that a portion of the submitted information consists of evaluations. Thus, provided the employee at issue was required to hold and did hold the appropriate certificate and was teaching at the time of the submitted teaching evaluations, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 21.355. However, the remaining information does not evaluate the performance of the teacher at issue; therefore, the district may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.101 on that ground.

Section 552.101 also encompasses 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, the I-9 form and its attachments, which we have marked, must be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with the federal laws and regulations governing the employment verification system.

Section 552.101 also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which 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. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). The types 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. *Id.* at 683. This office has found that the following types of information are excepted from required public disclosure under 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); and identities of victims of sexual abuse, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 440 (1986), 393 (1983), 339 (1982). In addition, in *Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied), the court determined that a governmental body must withhold information that would tend to identify a witness or victim of sexual harassment. *See Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d at 525 (“the public did not possess a legitimate interest in the identities of the individual witnesses, nor the details of their personal statements beyond what is contained in the documents that have been ordered released”). But this office has found that the public has a legitimate interest in information relating to employees of governmental bodies and their employment qualifications and job performance. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 562 at 10 (1990), 542 at 5 (1990); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 423 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow). But this office has found that the public has a legitimate interest in information relating to employees of governmental bodies and their employment qualifications and job performance. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 562 at 10 (1990), 542 at 5 (1990); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 423 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow). We have marked the information that is confidential under common-law privacy and that the district must withhold under section 552.101. But the remaining information is of legitimate public interest; therefore, the remaining information is not confidential under common-law privacy, and the district may not withhold it under section 552.101 on that ground.

You claim that portions of the employee’s 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, the district must withhold the information in the submitted transcripts we have marked pursuant to section 552.102(b).

The district asserts that some of the remaining information is excepted under section 552.108 of the Government Code. Section 552.108(a)(1) excepts from disclosure “[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime [if] release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime.” A governmental body claiming section 552.108 must reasonably explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See* Gov’t Code §§ 552.108(a)(1), 552.301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). Section 552.108 may be invoked by the proper custodian of information relating to an investigation or prosecution of criminal conduct. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 474 at 4-5 (1987). Where a governmental body possesses information relating to a pending case of a law enforcement agency, the governmental body may withhold the information under section 552.108 if (1) it demonstrates that the information relates to the pending case and (2) this office is provided with a representation from the law enforcement entity that the law enforcement entity wishes to withhold the information. You inform us that the FBI objects to the release of the information you have marked under section 552.108 because its release could interfere with an ongoing criminal investigation. Based on this representation, we conclude that the release of this information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See Houston Chronicle Publ’g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), *writ ref’d n.r.e.*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases). Therefore, the district may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.

You assert that some of the submitted information is excepted under section 552.117 of the Government Code. Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the current and former home addresses and telephone numbers, social security number, 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. Whether a particular piece of information is protected by 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 have submitted documentation showing that the employee at issue elected to keep these types of information confidential before the district received the request for information; therefore, the district must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.117.

We note that some of the remaining information is excepted under section 552.137 of the Government Code. 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* 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 at

issue do not appear to be of a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). You do not inform us that a member of the public has affirmatively consented to the release of any e-mail address contained in the submitted materials. Therefore, the district must withhold the e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137.

Finally, we note that the requestor is a representative of a Texas school district. This office has concluded that information subject to the Act may be transferred between governmental bodies without waiving exceptions to the public disclosure of that information or affecting its confidentiality. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-590 (1986); Open Records Decision Nos. 655 (1997), 567 (1990), 561 (1990), 516 (1989). These decisions are based on the well-settled policy of this state that governmental agencies should cooperate with each other in the interest of the efficient and economical administration of their statutory duties. *See* ORD 516. However, the transfer of confidential information from one governmental body to another is prohibited where the relevant confidentiality statute authorizes release of the confidential information only to specific entities, and the requesting governmental body is not among the statute's enumerated entities. *See* Attorney General Opinions DM-353 at 4 n. 6 (1995) (intergovernmental transfer permitted under statutory confidentiality provision only where disclosure to another governmental agency is required or authorized by law), JM-590 at 4-5 (1986) (where governmental body is not included among expressly enumerated entities to which confidential information may be disclosed, information may not be transferred to that governmental body); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 655 (1997), 650 (1996) (transfer of confidential information to federal agency impermissible unless federal law requires its disclosure). Section 21.355 of the Education Code and section 1324a of title 8 of the United States Code specifically protect educator and administrator evaluations and employment verification forms, and they specifically permit release to certain parties and in certain circumstances that do not include the request for information in this instance. *See generally* Attorney General Opinions DM-353 at 4 n. 6, JM-590 at 4-5. Therefore, the district may not release the information subject to these exceptions pursuant to the intergovernmental transfer doctrine. However, sections 552.102(b), 552.108, 552.117, and 552.137 of the Government Code and the doctrine of common-law privacy do not have specific release provisions governing public release of information. Thus, pursuant to the intergovernmental transfer doctrine, the district has the discretion to release to the requestor the information marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy, section 552.102(b), section 552.108, section 552.117, and section 552.137.

To conclude, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education Code and the I-9 form and its attachment we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with the federal laws and regulations governing the employment verification system. The district has the discretion to release the remaining information pursuant to the intergovernmental transfer doctrine. Otherwise, it must also withhold the following: the information marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy; the

transcripts marked under section 552.102(b) of the Government Code, with the exception of the employee's name, courses taken, and degree obtained; the information we have marked under section 552.117 of the Government Code; and the e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code. The district may also withhold the information marked under section 552.108 of the Government Code. The district must release the remaining information.⁵ This ruling does not address the applicability of FERPA to the submitted information. Should the district determine that all or portions of the submitted information consist of "education records" that must be withheld under FERPA, the district must dispose of that information in accordance with FERPA, rather than the Act.

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 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).

⁵As our ruling is dispositive, we do not address your other arguments to withhold the information at issue.

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,



James L. Coggeshall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JLC/jh

Ref: ID# 297208

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Carolyn Hoss
Paralegal, Legal Department
Fort Bend ISD
16431 Lexington Boulevard
Sugar Land, Texas 77479
(w/o enclosures)