



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 29, 2016

Ms. Haley Turner
Counsel for the Dripping Springs Independent School District
Walsh Gallegos Treviño Russo & Kyle P.C.
P.O. Box 2156
Austin, Texas 78768

OR2016-19541

Dear Ms. Turner:

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# 624322.

The Dripping Springs Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for all education records relating to the requestor's client's child during a specified time period. You state the district will release some information to the requestor. You claim portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.107 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.² We have also received and considered comments from the requestor's client. *See Gov't Code § 552.304*

¹Although you also claim portions of the requested information are not subject to the Act, you make no arguments to support this assertion. Therefore, we assume you have withdrawn this claim for the information at issue. *See Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302.* Additionally, although you also raise rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence, we note section 552.107 of the Government Code is the proper exception to raise when asserting the attorney-client privilege for information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 1-2 (2002).*

²We assume 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.

(interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Initially, we note you have redacted information pursuant to 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 (the “DOE”) has informed this office FERPA 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 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 redacted education records for our review. You have also submitted, in unredacted form, education records of students other than the requestor’s client’s child. Because our office is prohibited from reviewing an education record to determine the applicability of FERPA, we will not address FERPA with respect to the submitted video recordings. We note the requestor is a representative of a parent of one of the students to whom the submitted information pertains. Because our office is prohibited from reviewing these education records to determine the applicability of FERPA, we will not address the applicability of FERPA to any of the submitted records, other than to note that parents have a right of access under FERPA to their own child’s education records, and her right of access prevails over claims under section 552.101 of the Government Code. *See* 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(a)(1)(A); 34 C.F.R. § 99.3; *see also Equal Employment Opportunity Comm’n v. City of Orange, Tex.*, 905 F. Supp. 381, 382 (E.D. Tex. 1995) (holding FERPA prevails over inconsistent provision of state law). Such determinations under FERPA must be made by the educational authority in possession of the education records. The DOE also has informed our office, however, a parent’s right of access under FERPA to information about the parent’s child does not prevail over an educational institution’s right to assert the attorney-client privilege. Therefore, we will address your assertion of the attorney-client privilege under section 552.107 of the Government Code for the submitted information. Furthermore, we will address your claimed exceptions to the extent the requestor does not have a right of access to her client’s child’s education records within the submitted information under FERPA.

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 made confidential by other statutes, including section 418.182 of the Texas Homeland Security Act (the “HSA”), chapter 418 of the Government Code. Section 418.182 provides, in relevant part:

³A copy of this letter may be found on the Office of the Attorney General’s website at <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/files/og/20060725usdoe.pdf>.

(a) [I]nformation . . . 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 be related to a security system does not make such 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 exception to disclosure, a governmental body asserting section 418.182 must adequately explain how the responsive records fall within the scope of the statute. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must explain how claimed exception to disclosure applies).

You indicate the submitted video recordings, which you have marked Exhibit 4, reveal the locations and coverage areas of security surveillance cameras at a district school, and that the surveillance cameras are part of the security system used to protect this school from acts of terrorism or related criminal activity. Upon review, we find the submitted surveillance video recordings relate to the location of a security system used to protect public or private property from an act of terrorism or related criminal activity. *See 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 HSA 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). Therefore, the district must withhold Exhibit 4 under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.182 of the Government Code.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. *See* Gov't Code § 552.107(1). 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. ORD 676 at 6-7. First, a governmental body must demonstrate that the information constitutes or documents a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made "to facilitate 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 only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1)(A), (B), (C), (D), (E). 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.* 503(b)(1), meaning it was “not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those: (A) to whom disclosure is made to further the rendition of professional legal services to the client; or (B) reasonably necessary to transmit 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 the information you have marked in Exhibit 3 consists of communications between outside counsel for the district and employees and representatives of the district. Additionally, you state these communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services, the confidentiality of the communications have been maintained, and the communications were not intended to be shared with any third parties. Based on these representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Thus, the district may withhold the information you have marked within Exhibit 3 under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

In summary, the district may withhold the information you have marked within Exhibit 3 under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. To the extent you determine Exhibit 4 does not constitute student records to which the student’s parent has a right of access under FERPA, the district must withhold Exhibit 4 under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.182 of the Government Code. The district must release the remaining information.⁴

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.

⁴We note the information being released contains e-mail addresses to which the requestor has a right of access under section 552.137(b) of the Government Code. *See Gov’t Code § 552.137(b)*. However, Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009) is a previous determination authorizing all governmental bodies to withhold specific categories of information without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision, including e-mail addresses of members of the public under section 552.137 of the Government Code. Thus, if the district receives another request for this same information from a person who does not have a right of access to it, Open Records Decision No. 684 authorizes the district to redact the e-mail addresses at issue without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

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,



Cristian Rosas-Grillet
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CRG/bhf

Ref: ID# 624322

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Third Party
(w/o enclosures)