ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

August 9, 2013

Ms. Sarah Orman
Walsh, Anderson, Gallegos, Green and Treviño, P.C.
P.O. Box 2156
Austin, Texas 78768

OR2013-13844

Dear Ms. Orman:

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# 495879.

The Bridge City Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received two requests from the same requestor for the employment file of a named district employee, specified communications regarding the named district employee, and specified video recordings.[1] You state the district is releasing the requested employment file. You state the district does not have some of the requested video recordings.[2] You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information, a portion of which is a representative sample.[3]

---

[1]We note the district received clarification regarding this request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (governmental body may communicate with requestor for purpose of clarifying or narrowing request for information).

[2]The Act does not require a governmental body to release information that did not exist when a request for information was received or to prepare new information in response to a request. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266, 267-68, (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dism'd); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

[3]We assume that 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 that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

Initially, we note 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. § 1232g, 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.[4] 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 state you have redacted confidential student information under FERPA. You also have submitted unredacted education records for our review. Because our office is prohibited from reviewing these records to determine whether appropriate redactions under FERPA have been made, we will not address the applicability of FERPA to any of the submitted documents. Such determinations under FERPA must be made by the educational authority in possession of such records.[5] However, we will consider your arguments against disclosure of the submitted information.

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. This exception encompasses information other statutes make confidential. You claim section 552.101 in conjunction with section 418.182 of the Government Code, which was added to chapter 418 of the Government Code as part of the Texas Homeland Security Act. Section 418.182 provides in part:

> (a) Except as provided by Subsections (b) and (c), information, including access codes and passwords, in the possession of a governmental entity that relates to the specifications, operating procedures, or location of a security system used to protect public or private property from an act of terrorism or related criminal activity is confidential.

Id. § 418.182(a). The fact information may generally be related to a security system does not make the information *per se* confidential under section 418.182. *See* Open Records Decision No. 649 at 3 (1996) (language of confidentiality provision controls scope of its protection). Furthermore, the mere recitation by a governmental body of a statute's key terms is not sufficient to demonstrate the applicability of a claimed provision. As with any confidentiality provision, a governmental body asserting section 418.182 must adequately explain how the responsive information falls within the scope of the statute. *See* Gov't Code

---

[4]A copy of this letter may be found on the Office of the Attorney General's website: http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/20060725usdoe.pdf.

[5]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.

§ 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must explain how claimed exception to disclosure applies).

You assert the submitted video recording is confidential under section 418.182(a). You explain the information at issue consists of a video recorded by a security camera at a district school. You inform us one of the purposes of the security camera system is to protect public property from an act of terrorism or related activity. You state release of the submitted recording would reveal the location and coverage of the security camera and impact campus security. Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we conclude the district must withhold the submitted video recording under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.182(a) of the Government Code. *See generally Tex. Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Abbott*, 310 S.W.3d 670 (Tex. App.—Austin 2010, no pet.) (finding confidential under section 418.182 of the Homeland Security Act video recording containing images recorded by security cameras in Texas Capitol hallway, because specifications of security system included cameras' capabilities and video recording demonstrated those capabilities through characteristics, quality, and clarity of images recorded).

You raise section 552.107(1) of the Government Code for Exhibit 2. Section 552.107(1) 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 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 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 to only communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives. 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 to only 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. *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 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 Exhibit 2 consists of communications between attorneys for the district and district employees or representatives that were made for the purpose of providing legal services to the district. You state the communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find Exhibit 2 consists of privileged attorney-client communications the district may generally withhold under section 552.107(1). We note, however, some of these otherwise privileged e-mail strings include e-mails and an attachment received from or sent to non-privileged parties. Furthermore, if the e-mails and attachment received from or sent to non-privileged parties are removed from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear and stand alone, they are responsive to the requests for information. Therefore, if these non-privileged e-mails and attachment, which we have marked, are maintained by the district separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then the district may not withhold these non-privileged e-mails and attachments under section 552.107(1).

You raise section 552.111 of the Government Code for Exhibit 3. Section 552.111 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, no writ); 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, 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).

Section 552.111 can also encompass communications between a governmental body and a third-party, including a consultant or other party with a privity of interest. *See* Open Records Decision No. 561 at 9 (1990) (section 552.111 encompasses communications with party with which governmental body has privity of interest or common deliberative process). For section 552.111 to apply, the governmental body must identify the third party and explain the nature of its relationship with the governmental body. Section 552.111 is not applicable to a communication between the governmental body and a third party unless the governmental body establishes it has a privity of interest or common deliberative process with the third party. *See id.* at 9.

You state Exhibit 3 consists of communications between and among district administrators and employees regarding an employee grievance and the policy implications raised by the grievance. Based on your representations and our review, we find the district may withhold the information we have marked in Exhibit 3 under section 552.111. Upon review, however, we find the remaining information at issue to be either general administrative information that does not relate to policymaking, information that is purely factual in nature, or information shared with individuals with whom you have not demonstrated the district shares a common deliberative process. Thus, we find you have failed to demonstrate how the remaining information at issue is excepted under section 552.111. Accordingly, the remaining information in Exhibit 3 may not be withheld under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information if it (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). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be established. *Id.* at 681-82. The type of information considered highly intimate or 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 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). Upon review, we find the

information we have marked in Exhibit 3 constitutes information that is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate concern to the public. Accordingly, the district must withhold this marked information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, none of the remaining information is intimate or embarrassing information and not of legitimate public interest, and it may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home address and telephone number, emergency contact information, social security number, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who request this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code.[6] Gov't Code § 552.117(a). Whether a particular piece of information is protected by section 552.117 must be determined at the time the request for it is made. *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. Accordingly, if the individuals whose information we have marked in Exhibit 3 timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024, the district must withhold this information under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. If the individuals at issue did not make timely elections under section 552.024, the district may not withhold the information we have marked in Exhibit 3 under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code.

In summary, the district must withhold the submitted video recording under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.182(a) of the Government Code. The district may withhold Exhibit 2 under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code; however, the district may not withhold the non-privileged portions of the e-mails and attachment we have marked if they are maintained by the district separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear. The district may withhold the information we have marked in Exhibit 3 under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The district must withhold the information we have marked in Exhibit 3 under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. If the individuals whose information we have marked in Exhibit 3 timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024, the district must withhold this information under

---

[6]The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.[7]

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, 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,

Sarah Casterline
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

SEC/tch

Ref: ID# 495879

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

---

[7]We note the information being released contains the requestor's personal information, which the district might be required to withhold from the general public under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. However, in this instance, the requestor has a right of access to her own information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a) (person or person's authorized representative has special right of access to information held by governmental body that relates to person and that is protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect person's privacy interests); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual requests information concerning himself). Section 552.024 of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to withhold information subject to section 552.117 without requesting a decision from this office if the current or former employee or official chooses not to allow public access to the information. *See id.* § 552.024(c). Thus, if the district receives another request for this same information from a different requestor, section 552.024(c) authorizes the district to withhold the requestor's personal information if she has timely chosen to restrict public access to the information.