



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 11, 2016

Mr. Rusty Meurer
Counsel for the Laredo Community College
Kazen, Meurer & Pérez, L.L.P.
211 Calle Del Norte, Suite 100
Laredo, Texas 78041

OR2016-15575

Dear Mr. Meurer:

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# 617708.

The Laredo Community College (the "college"), which you represent, received a request for the personnel file of a named college employee. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.026, 552.101, 552.102, 552.111, and 552.137 of the Government Code. Additionally, you provide documentation showing you have notified the named employee of her right to submit comments to this office explaining why the submitted information should not be released.¹ See Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released). We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, you claim some of the submitted information is protected by the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), section 1232g of title 20 of the United States Code. The United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office has informed this office that FERPA does not permit state and local educational authorities to disclose to this office, without an adult student's consent, unredacted, personally identifiable information contained in education records for the purpose of our review in the open records ruling

¹As of the date of this letter, this office has not received comments from any third party explaining why any of the submitted information should not be released.

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 some of the information in Exhibit C. 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 records at issue. Such determinations under FERPA must be made by the college. Likewise, we do not address your argument under section 552.026 of the Government Code. *See* Gov’t Code §§ 552.026 (incorporating FERPA into Act), 552.114 (excepting from disclosure “student records”); Open Records Decision No. 539 (1990) (determining the same analysis applies under section 552.114 and FERPA). We will, however, address the applicability of the remaining claimed exceptions to the submitted information.

Next, we note you have redacted portions of the submitted information. We understand some of the redactions were made under section 552.147(b) of the Government Code.³ Further, you state the college will redact information pursuant to section 552.136(c) of the Government Code.⁴ However, we note you have also redacted dates of birth. A governmental body may not withhold information from the public without asking this office for a decision under section 552.301 of the Government Code unless a provision of the Act or a previous determination specifically authorizes the governmental body to do so. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.301(a); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (previous determinations). You do not assert, nor does our review of the records indicate, the college has been authorized to withhold a date of birth without seeking a ruling from this office. Therefore, information must be submitted in a manner that enables this office to determine whether the information comes within the scope of an exception to disclosure. In this instance, we can discern the nature of the redacted information; thus, being deprived of this information does not inhibit our ability to make a ruling. In the future, however, the college should refrain from redacting any information it is not authorized to withhold in seeking an open records ruling. Failure to do so may result in the presumption the redacted information is public. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.302.

²A copy of this letter may be found on the Office of the Attorney General’s website: <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/files/og/20060725usdoe.pdf>.

³Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person’s social security number from public release without requesting a decision from this office under the Act. Gov’t Code § 552.147(b).

⁴Section 552.136 of the Government Code permits a governmental body to withhold the information described in section 552.136(b) without the necessity of seeking a decision from this office. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.136(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.136(e). *See id.* § 552.136(d), (e).

Section 552.102(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy[.]” *Id.* § 552.102(a). We understand you to assert the privacy analysis under section 552.102(a) is the same as the common-law privacy test under section 552.101 of the Government Code. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). In *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Texas Newspapers, Inc.*, 652 S.W.2d 546, 549-51 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref’d n.r.e.), the court of appeals ruled the privacy test under section 552.102(a) is the same as the *Industrial Foundation* privacy test. However, the Texas Supreme Court has expressly disagreed with *Hubert’s* interpretation of section 552.102(a), and held the privacy standard under section 552.102(a) differs from the *Industrial Foundation* test under section 552.101. *See Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). The Texas Supreme Court also considered the applicability of section 552.102(a) and held it excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *See id.* at 348. Having carefully reviewed the information at issue, we have marked information that must be withheld under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code.⁵ However, we find none of the remaining information is subject to section 552.102(a), and the college may not withhold it on that basis.

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. Section 552.101 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.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered highly intimate or embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. This office has also found personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545 (1990)* (deferred compensation information, participation in voluntary investment program, election of optional insurance coverage, mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history). However, information concerning financial transactions between an employee and a public employer is generally of legitimate public interest. ORD 545. We note the payroll deductions for federal withholding tax are protected by common-law privacy and must be withheld under section 552.101, but the payroll deductions for social security, mandatory retirement, and Medicare are not protected by common-law privacy and may not be withheld under section 552.101. *See, e.g., ORDs 600 at 9-12* (participation in TexFlex), 545 at 3-5; *see also Attorney General Opinion GA-0572 at 4 (2007)* (public employee’s net salary protected by common-law privacy, but gross salary is not).

⁵As our ruling is dispositive, we need not consider your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

Upon review, we find the information we have marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the college must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.⁶ However, we find you have not demonstrated any of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the remaining information may not be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.111 of the Government Code 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, writ ref’d n.r.e.); 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 that are 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).

Upon review, we find the information at issue is general administrative and purely factual information. Thus, we find you have failed to show the information at issue consists of advice, opinions, or recommendations on the policymaking matters of the college.

⁶As our ruling is dispositive, we need not consider your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

Accordingly, the remaining information may not be withheld under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Some of the remaining information may be subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code.⁷ 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. *See Gov't Code* § 552.117(a)(1). We note section 552.117 is also applicable to personal cellular telephone numbers, provided the cellular telephone 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). 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 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. Therefore, if the individuals whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the college 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, if the individuals whose information is at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024, the college may not withhold the marked information under section 552.117(a)(1).

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 Gov't Code* § 552.137(a)-(c). Section 552.137 does not apply to an institutional e-mail address, the general e-mail address of a business, an e-mail address of a person who has a contractual relationship with a governmental body, an e-mail address of a vendor who seeks to contract with a governmental body, an e-mail address maintained by a governmental entity for one of its officials or employees, or an e-mail address provided to a governmental body on a letterhead. *See id.* § 552.137(c). Upon review, we find the college must withhold the personal e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner affirmatively consents to its public disclosure. However, the remaining

⁷The 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)*.

e-mail addresses in the submitted information are excluded by section 552.137(c). Accordingly, the college may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.137 of the Government Code.

We note some of the materials at issue may be protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; see Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit.

In summary, the college must withhold the information we have marked under (1) section 552.102(a) of the Government Code; (2) section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy; (3) section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code, if the individuals whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code and a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service; and (4) section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner affirmatively consents to its public disclosure. The college must release the remaining information; however, any information that is subject to copyright may be released only in accordance with copyright law.

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,



Nicholas A. Ybarra
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

NAY/bw

Ref: ID# 617708

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)