



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

July 10, 2014

Ms. Beverly Davidek
Counsel for the United Independent School District
J. Cruz & Associates, L.L.C.
216 West Village Boulevard, Suite 202
Laredo, Texas 78041

OR2014-11884

Dear Ms. Davidek:

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# 528661.

The United Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for all employee grievances filed during a specified time period. You indicate the district has redacted social security numbers pursuant to section 552.147(b) of the Government Code.¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, and 552.117 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office has informed this office the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), section 1232g of title 20 of the United States Code, does not permit state and local educational authorities to disclose to this office, without parental or an adult student's consent, unredacted, personally identifiable information contained in education records for

¹Section 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. *See* Gov't Code § 552.147(b).

the purpose of our review in the open records ruling process under the Act.² 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 assert FERPA applies to portions of the submitted documents. 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 records. *See* 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(a)(1)(A). Such determinations under FERPA must be made by the district. Likewise, we do not address your argument under section 552.026 of the Government Code. *See* Gov’t Code §§ 552.026 (incorporating FERPA into the Act), 552.114 (excepting from disclosure “student records”); Open Records Decision No. 539 (1990) (determining the same analysis applies under section 552.114 of the Government Code and FERPA). However, we will consider your remaining arguments against disclosure of the submitted information.

Next, we note some of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides, in relevant part:

(a) [T]he following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

(1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108; [and]

...

(3) information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of public or other funds by a governmental body;

(15) information regarded as open to the public under an agency’s policies;

...

(17) information that is also contained in a public court record; [and]

²A copy of this letter may be found on the Office of the Attorney General’s website at <http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/20060725usdoe.pdf>.

(18) a settlement agreement to which a governmental body is a party.

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1), (3), (15), (17), (18). The submitted information includes completed reports and evaluations that are subject to subsection 552.022(a)(1). The district must release this information pursuant to subsection 552.022(a)(1) unless it is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* § 552.022(a)(1). The submitted information also includes information in accounts that is subject to subsection 552.022(a)(3), a job posting that may be subject to section 552.022(a)(15), information that is also contained in a public court record that is subject to section 552.022(a)(17), and settlement agreements to which the district is a party that are subject to subsection 552.022(a)(18), which must be released unless they are made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* § 552.022(a)(3), (15), (17), (18). You seek to withhold the information subject to section 552.022 under section 552.103 of the Government Code. However, section 552.103 is discretionary in nature and does not make information confidential under the Act. *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 Gov't Code § 552.103); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Therefore, the information subject to section 552.022, which we have marked, may not be withheld under section 552.103 of the Government Code. However, as section 552.101 of the Government Code applies to confidential information and because section 552.117 of the Government Code makes information confidential under the Act, we will consider your arguments under these exceptions for the information we have marked. We will also consider your argument under section 552.103 and the remaining exceptions you claim for the information not subject to section 552.022.

We now turn to your argument under section 552.103 of the Government Code, as it is the most encompassing exception you claim. Section 552.103 provides, in part,

(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.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). A governmental body that claims an exception to disclosure under section 552.103 has the burden of providing relevant facts and documentation sufficient to establish the applicability of this exception to the information that it seeks to withhold. To meet this burden, the governmental body must demonstrate that (1) litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body receives the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to the pending or anticipated litigation. *See Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. 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 governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a). *See* ORD 551 at 4.

This office has long held that for the purposes of section 552.103, “litigation” includes “contested cases” conducted in a quasi-judicial forum. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 474 (1987), 368 (1983), 336 (1982), 301 (1982). Likewise, “contested cases” conducted under the Texas Administrative Procedure Act, chapter 2001 of the Government Code, constitute “litigation” for purposes of section 552.103. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 588 (1991) (concerning former State Board of Insurance proceeding), 301 (concerning hearing before Public Utilities Commission). In determining whether an administrative proceeding is conducted in a quasi-judicial forum, some of the factors this office considers are whether the administrative proceeding provides for discovery, evidence to be heard, factual questions to be resolved, the making of a record, and whether the proceeding is an adjudicative forum of first jurisdiction with appellate review of the resulting decision without a re-adjudication of fact questions. *See* ORD 588.

The submitted information consists of grievances filed with the district by a number of district employees. You explain grievances filed with the district are “litigation” because the district follows administrative procedures in handling such disputes. You state the district’s grievance process is a multi-level hearing process wherein various administrators initially hear a grievance, and the district’s Board of Trustees ultimately hears the grievance. You explain during these hearings the grievant is allowed to be represented by counsel and present evidence to the district. You state the grievant must complete the district’s grievance process in order to exhaust his administrative remedies before he can appeal to either the Texas Commissioner of Education or a court of competent jurisdiction. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the district’s administrative procedure for disputes is conducted in a quasi-judicial forum and, thus, constitutes litigation for purposes of section 552.103.

You claim the information submitted as Exhibits B through W is protected by section 552.103 of the Government Code. You inform us, and the submitted documentation demonstrates, the grievances at issue were filed prior to the date the district received the request for information. Upon review, however, we find some of the grievances at issue were resolved pursuant to mediated agreements prior to the date the district received the

request. Further, some of the grievances at issue were withdrawn by the grievants prior to the date the district received the request. Finally, the submitted documentation reveals the district resolved some of the grievances at issue by issuing a written decision, and you do not inform us, and the submitted documentation does not reveal, the grievants in these matters timely appealed the district's final decision prior to the date the district received the request. Thus, we find the district has not demonstrated how, on the date it received the instant request for information, it was involved in litigation that was pending or reasonably anticipated with respect to these grievances. Accordingly, the district may not withhold under section 552.103 of the Government Code the information pertaining to the grievances that were not pending on that date.

Upon review, however, we find the remaining grievances were pending on the date the district received the request. Thus, we determine the district was involved in pending litigation at the time it received the instant request with respect to these grievances. You state, and we agree, the information at issue directly relates to the subject of the pending litigation. Therefore, we conclude the district has demonstrated the applicability of section 552.103 of the Government Code to the pending grievances.

We note, however, the opposing parties to the pending grievances have seen or had access to some of the information at issue. The purpose of section 552.103 of the Government Code is to enable a governmental body to protect its position in litigation by forcing parties seeking information relating to the litigation to obtain such information through discovery procedures. *See* ORD 551 at 4-5. Thus, once the opposing party in pending litigation has seen or had access to information that is related to the litigation, there is no interest in withholding such information from public disclosure under section 552.103. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to the opposing party in pending litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a), and the district may not withhold such information on that basis. Therefore, the district may withhold the information pertaining to the pending grievances that the opposing parties have not seen or had access to, which we have marked, under section 552.103(a).³ We note the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 at 2 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

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

³As our ruling is dispositive for this information, we need not address your remaining arguments against its disclosure.

“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 state some of the remaining information consists of communications involving attorneys for the district and district employees and officials in their capacities as clients. You state these communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the district. You state these communications were intended to be, and 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, which we have marked. Accordingly, the district may withhold the information we marked under section 552.107(1) 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. This exception encompasses information other statutes make confidential. You raise section 552.101 in conjunction with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (the “ADA”). *See* 42 U.S.C. § 12101 *et seq.* Title I of the ADA provides that information about the medical conditions and medical histories of applicants or employees must be (1) collected and maintained on separate forms, (2) kept in separate medical files,

and (3) treated as a confidential medical record. Information obtained in the course of a "fitness for duty examination" conducted to determine whether an employee is still able to perform the essential functions of his or her job is to be treated as a confidential medical record as well. *See* 29 C.F.R. § 1630.14(c); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 641 (1996). Furthermore, the federal Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (the "EEOC") has determined that medical information for the purposes of the ADA includes "specific information about an individual's disability and related functional limitations, as well as general statements that an individual has a disability or that an ADA reasonable accommodation has been provided for a particular individual." *See* Letter from Ellen J. Vargyas, Legal Counsel, EEOC, to Barry Kearney, Associate General Counsel, National Labor Relations Board, 3 (Oct. 1, 1997). Federal regulations define "disability" for the purposes of the ADA as "(1) a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more of the major life activities of the individual; (2) a record of such an impairment; or (3) being regarded as having such an impairment." 29 C.F.R. § 1630.2(g). The regulations further provide that physical or mental impairment means: (1) any physiological disorder, or condition, cosmetic disfigurement, or anatomical loss affecting one or more of the following body systems: neurological, musculoskeletal, special sense organs, respiratory (including speech organs), cardiovascular, reproductive, digestive, genito-urinary, hemic and lymphatic, skin, and endocrine; or (2) any mental or psychological disorder, such as mental retardation, organic brain syndrome, emotional or mental illness, and specific learning disabilities. *See id.* § 1630.2(h). Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate the ADA is applicable to any portion of the remaining information, and none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information made confidential by the Medical Practice Act ("MPA"), subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code, which governs release of medical records. *See* Occ. Code §§ 151.001-168.202. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides, in relevant part:

- (a) A communication between a physician and a patient, relative to or in connection with any professional services as a physician to the patient, is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.
- (b) A record of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that is created or maintained by a physician is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.
- (c) A person who receives information from a confidential communication or record as described by this chapter, other than a person listed in Section 159.004 who is acting on the patient's behalf, may not disclose the information except to the extent that disclosure is consistent with the authorized purposes for which the information was first obtained.

Id. § 159.002(a)-(c). Information subject to the MPA includes both medical records and information obtained from those medical records. *See id.* §§ 159.002, .004. This office has concluded the protection afforded by section 159.002 extends only to records created by either a physician or someone under the supervision of a physician. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 487 (1987), 370 (1983), 343 (1982). We have further found when a file is created as a result of a hospital stay, all the documents in the file referring to diagnosis and treatment constitute physician-patient communications or “[r]ecords of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that are created or maintained by a physician.” Open Records Decision No. 546 (1990).

You argue some of the remaining information is subject to the MPA. However, we find you have not demonstrated how any portion of the information at issue consists of medical records or information obtained from medical records for purposes of the MPA, and the district may not withhold any of the information under section 552.101 on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information protected by section 21.355 of the Education Code, which provides, in relevant part, “[a] document evaluating the performance of a teacher or administrator is confidential.” Educ. Code § 21.355(a). The Third Court of Appeals has concluded a written reprimand constitutes an evaluation for purposes of section 21.355 because “it reflects the principal’s judgment regarding [a teacher’s] actions, gives corrective direction, and provides for further review.” *Abbott v. North East Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 212 S.W.3d 364 (Tex. App.—Austin 2006, no pet.). 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 administrator. *See* Open Records Decision No. 643 (1996). In Open Records Decision No. 643, we determined for purposes of section 21.355, the word “teacher” means a person who is required to and does in fact hold a teaching certificate under subchapter B of chapter 21 of the Education Code and who is in the process of teaching, as that term is commonly defined, at the time of the evaluation. *See id.* at 4. Further, in Open Records Decision No. 643, we determined an “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 as an administrator, as that term is commonly defined, at the time of the evaluation. *Id.*

You contend portions of the remaining information consist of confidential evaluations of district teachers and administrators by the district. We understand the teachers and administrators at issue were certified as teachers or administrators by the State Board of Educator Certification and were acting as teachers or administrators at the time the evaluations were prepared. Upon review, we find some of the information at issue, which we have marked, consists of evaluations of district teachers or administrators. Thus, the district must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education Code. However, the submitted documentation reveals the remaining information you seek to withhold on this basis pertains

to individuals who were not serving the functions of teachers or administrators at the time the information was prepared, or the information does not consist of documents evaluating the performance of a teacher or administrator for purposes of section 21.355. Thus, no portion of the remaining information is confidential under section 21.355 of the Education Code and the district may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) 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 demonstrated. *See id.* at 681-82. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). We note the scope of a public employee's privacy is narrow. *See* Open Records Decision No. 423 at 2 (1984).

In *Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied), the court addressed the applicability of the common-law privacy doctrine to files of an investigation of allegations of sexual harassment. The investigation files in the *Ellen* decision contained individual witness statements, an affidavit by the individual accused of the misconduct responding to the allegations, and conclusions of the board of inquiry that conducted the investigation. *Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d at 525. The court ordered the release of the affidavit of the person under investigation and the conclusions of the board of inquiry, stating the public's interest was sufficiently served by the disclosure of such documents. *Id.* In concluding, the *Ellen* court held "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." *Id.* Thus, if there is an adequate summary of an investigation of alleged sexual harassment, the investigation summary must be released under *Ellen*, along with the statement of the accused. However, the identities of the victims and witnesses of the alleged sexual harassment must be redacted, and their detailed statements must be withheld from disclosure. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 393 (1983), 339 (1982). However, when no adequate summary exists, detailed statements regarding the allegations must be released, but the identities of victims and witnesses must still be redacted from the statements. In either case, the identity of the individual accused of sexual harassment is not protected from public disclosure. We also note supervisors are generally not witnesses for purposes of *Ellen*, except where their statements appear in a non-supervisory context.

Some of the remaining information relates to an investigation into an alleged sexual harassment. Upon review, we determine the information at issue does not contain an adequate summary of the alleged sexual harassment. Because there is no adequate summary of the investigation, the district must generally release any information pertaining to the

sexual harassment investigation. However, the information at issue contains the identities of a victim of and witnesses to the alleged sexual harassment. Accordingly, the district must withhold such information, which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and the holding in *Ellen*. See *Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d at 525. However, common-law privacy is not applicable to information contained in public court records. See *Star-Telegram v. Walker*, 834 S.W.2d 54 (Tex. 1992). Among the submitted documents containing identifying information of the victim are documents filed with a court. Accordingly, the identifying information of the victim in these documents may not be withheld under common-law privacy. We further find some of the remaining information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the district must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find you have not demonstrated how any of the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the district may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

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 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, except as provided by section 552.024(a-1). See Gov't Code §§ 552.117(a)(1), .024. Section 552.024(a-1) of the Government Code provides, "A school district may not require an employee or former employee of the district to choose whether to allow public access to the employee's or former employee's social security number." *Id.*, § 552.024(a-1). Thus, the district may only withhold under section 552.117 the home address and telephone number, emergency contact information, and family member information of a current or former employee or official of the district who requests this information be kept confidential under section 552.024. 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). We also note a post office box number is not a "home address" for purposes of section 552.117(a). See Open Records Decision No. 622 at 4 (1994) (legislative history makes clear that purpose of Gov't Code § 552.117 is to protect public employees from being harassed at home). 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 only be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee 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. Therefore, to the extent the individuals whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the district must withhold the information we have

marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the marked cellular telephone numbers may be withheld only if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service. Conversely, to the extent the individuals at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024, the district may not withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1).

We note the remaining information contains e-mail addresses that are subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code.⁴ Section 552.137 of the Government Code 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 id.* § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail addresses at issue are not excluded by subsection (c). Therefore, the district must withhold the personal 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 district may withhold the information pertaining to the pending grievances that the opposing parties have not seen or had access to, which we have marked, under section 552.103(a). The district may withhold the information we marked under section 552.107 of the Government Code. The district must withhold (1) the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education Code; (2) the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy; (3) the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code, to the extent the individuals whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, but may withhold the marked cellular telephone numbers only if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service; and (4) the personal e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure. The district 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/>

⁴The 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).

[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,



Claire V. Morris Sloan
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CVMS/som

Ref: ID# 528661

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)