



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 28, 2016

Ms. Susan G. Morrison
Counsel for the Hutto Independent School District
Chamberlain McHaney
301 Congress Avenue, 21st Floor
Austin, Texas 78701

OR2016-26298

Dear Ms. Morrison:

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# 635665 (HISD PIR No. HDB08222016).

The Hutto Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for communications between two named district employees during a specified time period.¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.103, 552.108, and 552.114 of the Government Code.² We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.³

¹We note the district sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or over-broad request for public information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

²Although you also raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with sections 552.102, 552.103, 552.108, and 552.114 of the Government Code, this office has concluded section 552.101 does not encompass other exceptions found in the Act. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 1-2 (2002).

³We 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.

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 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”); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 224 (1979) (student’s handwritten comments protected under FERPA because they would make identity of student easily traceable through handwriting, style of expression, or particular incidents related in the comments). You assert FERPA applies to some of the submitted information. Because our office is prohibited from reviewing records to determine whether appropriate redactions under FERPA have been made, we do not address the applicability of FERPA. *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 552.114 of the Government Code, except to note FERPA is not applicable to law enforcement records maintained by a district’s police department that were created by the district’s police department for a law enforcement purpose. *See id.* § 1232g(a)(4)(B)(ii); 34 C.F.R. §§ 99.3, 99.8; *see also* Gov’t Code §§ 552.026 (incorporating FERPA into the Act), .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 the district has redacted metadata from the submitted information and we understand the district to assert this information is not responsive. Upon review, we find the information at issue is responsive to the request for information. The district does not assert, nor does our review of the records indicate, the district has been authorized to withhold this information without seeking a ruling from this office. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.301(a); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001). 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 district should refrain from redacting any information that 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.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.”

⁴A 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>.

Id. § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses information made confidential by other statutes, such as sections 418.176, 418.177, and 418.181 of the Texas Homeland Security Act (the “HSA”), chapter 418 of the Government Code. Sections 418.176 through 418.182 were added to chapter 418 as part of the HSA. These provisions make certain information related to terrorism confidential. Section 418.176 of the HSA provides in relevant part:

(a) Information is confidential if the information is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental entity for the purpose of preventing, detecting, responding to, or investigating an act of terrorism or related criminal activity and:

- (1) relates to the staffing requirements of an emergency response provider, including a law enforcement agency, a fire-fighting agency, or an emergency services agency;
- (2) relates to a tactical plan of the provider; or
- (3) consists of a list or compilation of pager or telephone numbers, including mobile and cellular telephone numbers of the provider.

Id. § 418.176(a). Section 418.177 provides that information is confidential if it:

- (1) is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental entity for the purpose of preventing, detecting, or investigating an act of terrorism or related criminal activity; and
- (2) relates to an assessment by or for a governmental entity, or an assessment that is maintained by a governmental entity, of the risk or vulnerability of persons or property, including critical infrastructure, to an act of terrorism or related criminal activity.

Id. § 418.177. Section 418.181 provides:

Those documents or portions of documents in the possession of a governmental entity are confidential if they identify the technical details of particular vulnerabilities of critical infrastructure to an act of terrorism.

Id. § 418.181. The fact that information may be related to a governmental body’s security concerns, biological toxins, or emergency preparedness does not make such information *per se* confidential under the HSA. *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 one of the confidentiality provisions of the HSA must adequately explain how the responsive records fall within the scope of the claimed provision. *See* Gov’t Code

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

The district asserts some of the submitted information pertains to emergency preparedness and response plans. The district further asserts the information at issue contains information relating to tactical plans that assess risk and vulnerabilities to an act of terrorism or related criminal activity in district facilities. Upon review, we find the district failed to demonstrate the information at issue is confidential under section 418.176, 418.177, or 418.181 of the Government Code. Therefore, the district may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with sections 418.176, 418.177, or 418.181 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 143.089 of the Local Government Code. The application of chapter 143 of the Local Government Code is delineated in section 143.002 of that code, which provides:

(a) This chapter applies only to a municipality:

(1) that:

(A) has a population of 10,000 or more;

(B) has a paid fire department or police department; and

(C) has voted to adopt this chapter or the law codified by this chapter; or

(2) whose election to adopt this chapter and whose acts subsequent to that election were validated by the law enacted by House Bill 822, Acts of the 73rd Legislature, Regular Session, 1993.

Local Gov't Code § 143.002(a). Thus, chapter 143 of the Local Government Code applies only to civil service municipalities that have voted to adopt the chapter. The district is not a municipality. Furthermore, the district has not explained how section 143.089 of the Local Government Code is applicable to information held by the district. Accordingly, the district may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses 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). 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 some of the submitted information consists of confidential evaluations of a teacher or administrator by the district. However, we note the information at issue pertains to an individual employed as the police chief of the district’s police department. Section 21.355 protects evaluations of only teachers and administrators who held the proper certifications and were performing the functions of teachers and administrators at the times of the evaluations. You do not inform us this employee was certified as a teacher or administrator and was acting as a teacher or administrator at the time the information at issue was prepared. Accordingly, we find the district failed to demonstrate any of the information at issue consists of documents evaluating the performance of a teacher or administrator for purposes of section 21.355 of the Education Code. Accordingly, none of the information at issue may be withheld 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 satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. 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 public generally has a legitimate interest in information that relates to public employment and public employees. *See* Open Records Decisions Nos. 562 at 10 (1990) (personnel file information does not involve most intimate aspects of human affairs, but in fact touches on matters of legitimate public concern), 542 (1990), 470 at 4 (1987) (public has legitimate interest in job qualifications and performance of public employees), 444 at 5-6 (1986) (public has legitimate interest in knowing reasons for dismissal, demotion, promotion, or resignation of public employees), 423 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow). Upon review, we find the information we marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the district must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.⁵ However, we find none of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing information and of no legitimate public

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

interest, and it may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

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.” Gov’t Code § 552.102(a). We understand the district 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. As previously mentioned, common-law privacy 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.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. 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 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. Upon review, we find none of the remaining information is subject to section 552.102(a) of the Government Code, and the district may not withhold any of the remaining information on that basis.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides, in relevant part, the following:

(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 has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that the section 552.103(a) exception applies in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received the request for information, and (2) the requested information is related to that litigation. See *Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, orig.

proceeding); *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 parts of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a). See ORD 551 at 4.

The question of whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. See Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). To demonstrate litigation is reasonably anticipated, the governmental body must furnish concrete evidence that litigation involving a specific matter is realistically contemplated and is more than mere conjecture. *Id.* Concrete evidence to support a claim that litigation is reasonably anticipated may include, for example, an attorney for a potential opposing party making a demand for payment and asserting an intent to sue if such payments are not made. Open Records Decision Nos. 555 at 3 (1990), 346 (1982). In addition, this office has concluded litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney. See Open Records Decision No. 288 at 2 (1981). However, an individual publicly threatening to bring suit against a governmental body, but who does not actually take objective steps toward filing suit, is not concrete evidence that litigation is reasonably anticipated. See Open Records Decision No. 331 at 1-2 (1982).

The district claims section 552.103 for the information in Exhibit E. The district claims the information at issue relates to a threat of litigation and the district's subsequent reactions to such threat of litigation. However, upon review, we find the district has not demonstrated any party had taken concrete steps toward the initiation of litigation when the district received the request for information. Thus, we conclude the district failed to demonstrate it reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the request for information. Therefore, the district may not withhold Exhibit E under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

Section 552.108 of the Government Code provides in part the following:

(a) Information held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if:

(1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime[.]

...

(b) An internal record or notation of a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that is maintained for internal use in matters relating to law enforcement or prosecution is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if:

(1) release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution[.]

Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(1), (b)(1). A governmental body raising section 552.108 must explain the applicability of that section. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must provide comments explaining why exceptions raised should apply to information requested). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(1) or section 552.108(b)(1) must explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* § 552.108(a)(1), (b)(1); *Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). The district asserts the information at issue includes records from the district's police department and contains information related to law enforcement, corrections, and prosecutorial information. The district asserts the information may relate to ongoing investigations, informants, performance reviews, and possible weaknesses in the district's police department. The district does not inform us the information at issue pertains to a specific ongoing criminal investigation or prosecution, nor has the district explained how its release would interfere in some way with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. Thus, the district failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.108(a)(1) or section 552.108(b)(1). Accordingly, the district may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.108(a)(1) or section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code.

Some of the remaining information may be subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code.⁶ Section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure the home addresses, home telephone numbers, emergency contact information, social security number, and family member information of a peace officer, as defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, regardless of whether the peace officer complies with section 552.024 of the Government Code or section 552.1175 of the Government Code. Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(2). We note some of the remaining information pertains to a former district police officer and it is unclear whether this individual is currently a licensed peace officer as defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Thus, if the individual at issue is currently a licensed peace officer as defined by article 2.12, the district must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code. If, however, the individual at issue is not currently a licensed peace officer, his personal information may not be withheld under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code.

In the event the individual at issue is no longer a licensed peace officer, then some of the information at issue may be subject to section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. Section 552.117(a)(1) excepts from disclosure the home address and telephone number, emergency contact information, social security number, and family member information of current or former employees or officials of a governmental body who request this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.117(a)(1). 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

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

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 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, to the extent the individuals whose information we marked timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the district must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. Conversely, to the extent the individuals at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024, the district may not withhold the marked information under section 552.117(a)(1).

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). 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). We are unable to determine whether the personal e-mail address within the remaining information, which is located within e-mails communicating official business of the district, belong to district officials or employees. Thus, we rule conditionally. To the extent the e-mail address within the remaining information is the personal e-mail address of a district official or employee, or to the extent subsection (c) applies, this information is not subject to section 552.137 and may not be withheld on that basis. *See Austin Bulldog v. Leffingwell*, 490 S.W.3d 240 (Tex. App.—Austin 2016, no pet.) (holding personal e-mail addresses of government officials used to conduct official government business are not e-mail addresses of "members of the public" for purposes of Gov't Code § 552.137(a)). However, to the extent the e-mail address within the remaining information is not the personal e-mail address of a district official or employee and subsection (c) does not apply, this information is subject to section 552.137 and must be withheld under section 552.137, unless the owner of the e-mail address affirmatively consents to its release.


In summary, the district must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. If the individual at issue is currently a licensed peace officer as defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, the district must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code. To the extent the individuals whose information we marked timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the district must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. To the extent the e-mail address within the remaining information is not the personal e-mail address of a district official or employee and subsection (c) does not apply, this information

is subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code and must be withheld on that basis, unless the owner of the e-mail address affirmatively consents to its release. 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/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,



Paige Thompson
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

PT/eb

Ref: ID# 635665

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)