



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 16, 2017

Ms. Holly A. Sherman
Counsel for KIPP Austin Public Schools
Rogers, Morris & Grover, L.L.P.
5718 Westheimer Road, Suite 1200
Houston, Texas 77057

OR2017-03594

Dear Ms. Sherman:

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# 646049.

KIPP Austin Public Schools ("KIPP"), which you represent, received a request for four categories of information pertaining to a specified collision involving the requestor's client, including information related to traffic patterns concerning the area of the collision and bus policies and procedures for the same area. You state KIPP has released some information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.103 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

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." Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses information protected by other statutes. As part of the Texas Homeland Security Act, sections 418.176 through 418.182 were added to chapter 418 of the Government Code. These provisions make confidential certain information related to terrorism. Section 418.177 provides:

Information is confidential if the information:

¹We 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.

(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. Section 418.182 provides, in relevant part,

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

(b) Financial information in the possession of a governmental entity that relates to the expenditure of funds by a governmental entity for a security system is public information that is not excepted from required disclosure under Chapter 552.

Id. § 418.182(a), (b). The fact that information may relate to a governmental body's security concerns does not make the information *per se* confidential under the Texas Homeland Security Act. *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 Texas Homeland Security Act 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).

Upon review, KIPP has failed to establish any portion of the submitted information reveals the technical details of particular vulnerabilities of critical infrastructure to an act of terrorism. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 542 (1990) (stating that governmental body has burden of establishing that exception applies to requested information), 532 (1989), 515 (1988), 252 (1980). Additionally, we find KIPP has not demonstrated the information at issue was collected, assembled, or is maintained by or for KIPP for the purpose of

preventing, detecting, or investigating an act of terrorism or related criminal activity and relates to an assessment of the risk or vulnerability of persons or property, including critical infrastructure, to an act of terrorism or related criminal activity. Further, we find KIPP has failed to demonstrate the information at issue relates to the specifications, operating procedures, or location of a security system used to protect public or private property from terrorism or related criminal activity. Therefore, KIPP may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.177, section 418.181, or section 418.182 of the Government Code.

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).

You state, and provide supporting documentation showing, simultaneously with the instant request, the requestor states the destruction of the requested information would be considered as spoliation of evidence in a court of law. You state “KIPP interprets this litigation hold to be a threat of potential litigation against KIPP.” However, we note the collision at issue involves the requestor’s client and a private individual. You have not provided this office with any demonstration that, when KIPP received the instant request for information, the requestor or any other individual had made any threat to sue KIPP, or made any claim against KIPP for damages. Further, you do not explain, and the submitted information does not reflect, KIPP is a party to the anticipated litigation. Thus, KIPP does not have a litigation interest in the matter for purposes of section 552.103. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.103(a); Open Records Decision No. 575 at 2 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.103 only applies when governmental body is party to litigation). Accordingly, we conclude KIPP has not demonstrated any party had taken any concrete steps toward initiating litigation against KIPP as of the date KIPP received the request. Therefore, you have not demonstrated the applicability of section 552.103 of the Government Code to the submitted information and KIPP may not withhold the information on that basis.

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, emergency contact information, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code.² Gov’t Code § 552.117(a)(1). Section 552.117 is also applicable to 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) (statutory predecessor to section 552.117 not applicable to cellular telephone numbers provided and paid for by governmental body and intended for official use). Whether a particular piece of information is protected by section 552.117 must be determined at the time the request for the information is made. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Therefore, a governmental body must withhold information under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former official or employee only if the individual made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for information was made. Accordingly, KIPP must withhold the cellular telephone numbers we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code if the individuals whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality pursuant to section 552.024 of the Government Code and the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. KIPP may not withhold this information if the individuals

²The 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).

whose information is at issue did not make a timely election to keep the information confidential or the cellular telephone service is paid for by a governmental body.

In summary, if the individuals whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality pursuant to section 552.024 of the Government Code and the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body, KIPP must withhold the cellular telephone numbers we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.

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,



Britni Ramirez
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

BR/som

Ref: ID# 646049

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)