



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 19, 2019

Ms. Jennifer Slack  
Assistant District Attorneys  
Lubbock County  
P.O. Box 10536  
Lubbock, Texas 79408-3536

OR2019-07672

Dear Ms. Slack:

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# 755082 (ORR.1186).

The Lubbock County District Attorney's Office (the "district attorney's office") received a request for all e-mails sent to or from all employees of specified Lubbock County (the "county") departments during a certain time period.<sup>1</sup> You claim some of the submitted information is not subject to the Act. You also claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.103, 552.104, 552.107, 552.108, 552.111, 552.117, 552.1175, 552.130, 552.136, 552.137, 552.139, 552.147, and 552.152 of the Government Code. Additionally, you state release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of Door3 Business Applications, Inc. ("Door3") and Tyler Technologies ("Tyler"). Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, the district attorney's office notified these third parties of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be

---

<sup>1</sup>You state the district attorney's office sent the requestor an estimate of charges pursuant to section 552.2615 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.2615. The estimate of charges required the requestor to provide a deposit for payment of anticipated costs under section 552.263 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.263(a). You inform us the district attorney's office received the required deposit on December 19, 2018. *See id.* § 552.263(e) (if governmental body requires deposit or bond for anticipated costs pursuant to section 552.263, request for information is considered to have been received on date governmental body receives bond or deposit).

released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in the Act in certain circumstances). We have received comments from Tyler. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>2</sup>

You argue some of the submitted information is not “public information” subject to disclosure under the Act. Section 552.002(a) of the Government Code defines “public information” as information that is written, produced, collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business:

- (1) by a governmental body;
- (2) for a governmental body and the governmental body:
  - (A) owns the information;
  - (B) has a right of access to the information; or
  - (C) spends or contributes public money for the purpose of writing, producing, collecting, assembling, or maintaining the information; or
- (3) by an individual officer or employee of a governmental body in the officer's or employee's official capacity and the information pertains to official business of the governmental body.

Gov't Code § 552.002(a). Thus, virtually all of the information in a governmental body's physical possession constitutes public information and thus is subject to the Act. *Id.* § 552.002(a)(1); *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 549 at 4 (1990), 514 at 1-2 (1988). The Act also encompasses information that a governmental body does not physically possess. Information that is written, produced, collected, assembled, or maintained by a third party, including an individual officer or employee of a governmental body in his or her official capacity, may be subject to disclosure under the Act if a governmental body owns, has a right of access, or spends or contributes public money for the purpose of writing, producing, collecting, assembling, or maintaining the information. Gov't Code § 552.002(a); *see* Open Records Decision No. 462 at 4 (1987). Information is “in connection with the transaction of official business” if the information is created by, transmitted to, received by, or maintained by a person or entity performing official business or a government function on behalf of a governmental body and the information pertains to official business of the governmental body. *See* Gov't Code § 552.002(a-1). Moreover, section 552.001 of the Act

---

<sup>2</sup>We 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 those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

provides that it is the policy of this state that each person is entitled, unless otherwise expressly provided by law, at all times to complete information about the affairs of government and the official acts of public officials and employees. *See id.* § 552.001(a).

You assert some of the submitted information consists of communications that relate to personal matters of county employees, and argue this information does not constitute public information since the nature of these communications do not pertain to the transaction of official business of the county. Further, you inform us the district attorney's office has a policy that allows for incidental use of e-mail, and you state the use of resources to create the information was *de minimis*. *See* Open Records Decision No. 635 at 7 (1995) (section 552.002 not applicable to personal information unrelated to official business and created or maintained by state employee involving *de minimis* use of state resources). Upon review, we find the information at issue pertains to employee leave and is maintained in connection with the transaction of official business of the district attorney's office and, thus, is subject to the Act. Accordingly, we will address your arguments against disclosure of this information.

Additionally, in Open Records Decision No. 581 (1990), this office determined certain computer information, such as source codes, documentation information, and other computer programming, that has no significance other than its use as a tool for the maintenance, manipulation, or protection of public property is not the kind of information made public under section 552.021 of the Government Code. You argue some of the remaining information consists of information used solely as tools for the maintenance, manipulation, or protection of public property and has no other significance. Based on the reasoning in that decision and our review of the information at issue, we determine the IP addresses, usernames, and passwords you marked and indicated do not constitute public information under section 552.002. Accordingly, the IP addresses, usernames, and passwords at issue are not subject to the Act, and the district attorney's office is not required to release this information in response to this request.<sup>3</sup> However, we find the remaining information at issue has significance other than its use as a tool for the maintenance, manipulation, or protection of public property. Accordingly, we conclude the remaining information is "public information" as defined by section 552.002, and it is subject to disclosure under the Act.

You also argue some of the remaining information constitutes records of the judiciary. The Act generally requires the public disclosure of information maintained by a "governmental body." *See* Gov't Code § 552.002(a)(1). While the Act's definition of a "governmental body" is broad, it specifically excludes the judiciary. *See id.* § 552.003(1)(B). Information "collected, assembled, or maintained by or for the judiciary" is not subject to the Act but instead is "governed by rules adopted by the Supreme Court of Texas or by other applicable laws and rules." *Id.* § 552.0035(a); *cf.* Open Records Decision No. 131 (1976) (applying

---

<sup>3</sup>As we are able to make this determination, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

statutory predecessor to judiciary exclusion under Gov't Code § 552.003(1)(B) prior to enactment of Gov't Code § 552.0035). In determining whether a governmental entity falls within the judiciary exception of the Act, this office looks to whether governmental entity maintains the relevant records as an agent of the judiciary in regard to judicial, as opposed to administrative functions. See Open Records Decision No. 646 at 2-3 (1996) (citing *Benavides v. Lee*, 665 S.W.2d 151 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1983, no writ)). Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate any portion of the information at issue consists of judicial records maintained by the district attorney's office on behalf of the judiciary. Therefore, this information is subject to the Act and may only be withheld if it is excepted from disclosure under the Act.

Next, we note an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. See Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received comments from Door3 explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude Door3 has a protected proprietary interest in the submitted information. See *id.* § 552.110; Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3. Accordingly, the district attorney's office may not withhold any of the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest Door3 may have in it.

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, the governmental body's receipt of a letter containing a specific threat to sue the governmental body from an attorney for a potential opposing party.<sup>4</sup> Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be "realistically contemplated"). On the other hand, this office has determined that if an individual publicly threatens to bring suit against a governmental body, but does not actually take objective steps toward filing suit, litigation is not reasonably anticipated. Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982). Further, the fact that a potential opposing party has hired an attorney who makes a request for information does not establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated. Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).

You state, and provide documentation showing, prior to the district attorney's office's receipt of the instant request for information, the county received a cease and desist letter from an attorney representing a vendor for the county regarding alleged breach of contract claims against the county. You also state the district attorney's office anticipates the vendor at issue will take legal action against the county regarding the contract claims, including termination of the contract. However, upon review, we find you have not provided this office with evidence that any party had taken any objective steps toward filing litigation prior to the date the district attorney's office received the present request for information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e); ORD 331. Thus, we conclude you have failed to demonstrate the district attorney's office reasonably anticipated litigation on the date it received the present request for information. Therefore, the district attorney's office may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming 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

---

<sup>4</sup>In addition, this office has concluded that litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party took the following objective steps toward litigation: filed a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, *see* Open Records Decision No. 336 (1982); hired an attorney who made a demand for disputed payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, *see* Open Records Decision No. 346 (1982); and threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney, *see* Open Records Decision No. 288 (1981).

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 “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 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). 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. *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 the information you marked consists of communications involving an attorney in the district attorney’s office and county personnel that were made for the purpose of providing legal services to the county. You state the communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have established the submitted information consists of privileged attorney-client communications. Therefore, the district attorney’s office may withhold the information you marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.104(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder.” Gov’t Code § 552.104(a). The “test under section 552.104 is whether knowing another bidder’s [or competitor’s information] would be an advantage, not whether it would be a decisive advantage.” *Boeing Co. v. Paxton*, 466 S.W.3d 831, 841 (Tex. 2015). You state the information you marked and indicated pertains to contract negotiations involving the county for which final agreements have not been executed. Further, you state release of the information at issue would hamper the county’s ability to negotiate, and would give competitors an unfair advantage in future

bidding situations. After review of the information at issue and consideration of the arguments, we find you have established the release of most of the information at issue would give advantage to a competitor or bidder. Accordingly, with the exception of the information we marked for release, the district attorney's office may withhold the information you marked and indicated under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code.<sup>5</sup> However, we find you have failed to establish the remaining information at issue would give an advantage to a competitor or bidder. Thus, the district attorney's office may not withhold the information we marked for release under section 552.104.

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; see also *City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351, 364 (Tex. 2000); *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.). 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). However, 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. ORD 615 at 5-6; see also *Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d at 364 (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking).

Further, section 552.111 does not protect facts and written observations of facts and events severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. See *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 37 S.W.3d at 157; 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).

---

<sup>5</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

Section 552.111 can also encompass communications between a governmental body and a third party, including a consultant or other party with a privity of interest. *See* Open Records Decision No. 561 at 9 (1990) (section 552.111 encompasses communications with party with which governmental body has privity of interest or common deliberative process). For section 552.111 to apply, the governmental body must identify the third party and explain the nature of its relationship with the governmental body. Section 552.111 is not applicable to a communication between the governmental body and a third party unless the governmental body establishes it has a privity of interest or common deliberative process with the third party. *See id.*

This office has also concluded a preliminary draft of a document intended for public release in its final form necessarily represents the drafter's advice, opinion, and recommendation with regard to the form and content of the final document, so as to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.111. *See* Open Records Decision No. 559 at 2 (1990) (applying statutory predecessor). Section 552.111 protects factual information in the draft that also will be included in the final version of the document. *See id.* at 2-3. Thus, section 552.111 encompasses the entire contents, including comments, underlining, deletions, and proofreading marks, of a preliminary draft of a policymaking document that will be released to the public in its final form. *See id.* at 2.

You seek to withhold some of the remaining information under section 552.111 of the Government Code. You state the information at issue consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations of employees and officials of the county and representatives of vendors with which the county shares a privity of interest regarding policymaking matters of the county. You further state the information at issue includes draft documents that will be released in their final forms. Based upon your representations and our review, we find portions of the information at issue consist of advice, opinions, or recommendations on the policymaking matters of the county. Accordingly, the district attorney's office may withhold the information we marked and indicated under section 552.111 of the Government Code.<sup>6</sup> However, we find the remaining information at issue is general administrative and purely factual information that does not pertain to policymaking. Thus, we find the district attorney's office has not shown the remaining information at issue consists of advice, opinions, or recommendations on the policymaking matters of the district attorney's office. Therefore, the district attorney's office may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Section 552.110 of the Government Code protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure two types of information: trade secrets and commercial or financial information the release of which would cause a third party substantial competitive harm. Section 552.110(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "[a] trade secret obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision." Gov't

---

<sup>6</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

Code § 552.110(a). The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of trade secret from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts. *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex. 1958); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 2 (1990). Section 757 provides a trade secret is

any formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is used in one's business, and which gives him an opportunity to obtain an advantage over competitors who do not know or use it. It may be a formula for a chemical compound, a process of manufacturing, treating or preserving materials, a pattern for a machine or other device, or a list of customers. It differs from other secret information in a business . . . in that it is not simply information as to single or ephemeral events in the conduct of the business . . . . A trade secret is a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business. . . . It may . . . relate to the sale of goods or to other operations in the business, such as a code for determining discounts, rebates or other concessions in a price list or catalogue, or a list of specialized customers, or a method of bookkeeping or other office management.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see also Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776. In determining whether particular information constitutes a trade secret, this office considers the Restatement's definition of trade secret as well as the Restatement's list of six trade secret factors.<sup>7</sup> RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b. This office must accept a private person's claim for exception as valid under that branch if that person establishes a *prima facie* case for exception and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. ORD 552 at 5-6. However, we cannot conclude section 552.110(a) applies unless it has been shown the information meets the definition of a trade secret and the necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish a trade secret claim. *See* Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

Section 552.110(b) excepts from disclosure "[c]ommercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that disclosure would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained[.]" Gov't Code § 552.110(b). Section 552.110(b) requires a specific factual or evidentiary showing, not conclusory or generalized allegations, substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the requested information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 661

---

<sup>7</sup>The following are the six factors that the Restatement gives as indicia of whether information constitutes a trade secret: (1) the extent to which the information is known outside of the company; (2) the extent to which it is known by employees and others involved in the company's business; (3) the extent of measures taken by the company to guard the secrecy of the information; (4) the value of the information to the company and its competitors; (5) the amount of effort or money expended by the company in developing the information; (6) the ease or difficulty with which the information could be properly acquired or duplicated by others. RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b; *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

at 5-6 (1999) (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

Upon review, we find Tyler has not demonstrated any of the information at issue meets the definition of a trade secret or demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(a). We also find Tyler has failed to establish release of the information at issue would cause it substantial competitive injury. *See id.* § 552.110(b). Therefore, the district attorney's office may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.110 of the Government Code.

Section 552.139 of the Government Code provides, in part:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information that relates to computer network security, to restricted information under Section 2059.055 [of the Government Code], or to the design, operation, or defense of a computer network.

(b) The following information is confidential:

(1) a computer network vulnerability report; [and]

(2) any other assessment of the extent to which data processing operations, a computer, a computer program, network, system, or system interface, or software of a governmental body or of a contractor of a governmental body is vulnerable to unauthorized access or harm, including an assessment of the extent to which the governmental body's or contractor's electronically stored information containing sensitive or critical information is vulnerable to alteration, damage, erasure, or inappropriate use[.]

*Id.* § 552.139(a), (b)(1)-(2). Section 2059.055 of the Government Code provides, in part:

(b) Network security information is confidential under this section if the information is:

(1) related to passwords, personal identification numbers, access codes, encryption, or other components of the security system of a state agency;

(2) collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental entity to prevent, detect, or investigate criminal activity; or

(3) related to an assessment, made by or for a governmental entity or maintained by a governmental entity, of the vulnerability of a network to criminal activity.

*Id.* § 2059.055(b). You assert the information you marked is confidential pursuant to section 552.139. You state the information at issue consists of information related to security measures used to protect the county's computer network. You contend release of the information at issue would pose a threat to the security of the county's network infrastructure by allowing unauthorized users to extract or sabotage information, resulting in the disruption of county operations. Based on your representations and our review, we find most of the information you marked relates to computer network security, and the design, operation, or defense of the county's computer network. Accordingly, with the exception of the information we marked for release, the district attorney's office must withhold the information you marked under section 552.139 of the Government Code.<sup>8</sup> However, upon review, we find you have not demonstrated the applicability of section 552.139 to the information we marked for release. Consequently, the district attorney's office may not withhold this information under section 552.139 of the Government Code.

Section 552.152 of the Government Code provides:

Information in the custody of a governmental body that relates to an employee or officer of the governmental body is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if, under the specific circumstances pertaining to the employee or officer, disclosure of the information would subject the employee or officer to a substantial threat of physical harm.

*Id.* § 552.152. You inform us the information you marked identifies undercover law enforcement officers working in an undercover capacity. You assert release of the officers' identities would subject the officers to a substantial threat of physical harm. Therefore, we find section 552.152 is applicable to the information at issue. Accordingly, the district attorney's office must withhold the identifying information of the undercover law enforcement officers you marked under section 552.152 of the Government Code.<sup>9</sup>

Section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if . . . release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime[.]" *Id.* § 552.108(a)(1). Generally, a governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(1) must explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You state the information you marked relates to pending criminal investigations, and release of the information would interfere with the investigation and prosecution of the cases. Based upon this representation, we conclude the release of the information you marked would interfere with the detection, investigation,

---

<sup>8</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

<sup>9</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

or prosecution of crime. *See Houston Chronicle Publ'g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Thus, section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable to the information at issue. Accordingly, the district attorney's office may withhold the information you marked under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.108(b)(1) excepts from disclosure the internal records and notations of law enforcement agencies and prosecutors when their release would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. Gov't Code § 552.108(b)(1); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 531 at 2 (1989). Section 552.108(b)(1) is intended to protect "information which, if released, would permit private citizens to anticipate weaknesses in a police department, avoid detection, jeopardize officer safety, and generally undermine police efforts to effectuate the laws of this State." *See City of Ft. Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.). To demonstrate the applicability of this exception, a governmental body must meet its burden of explaining how and why release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. Open Records Decision No. 562 at 10 (1990). This office has concluded section 552.108(b)(1) excepts from public disclosure information relating to the security or operation of a law enforcement agency. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 (release of detailed use of force guidelines would unduly interfere with law enforcement), 252 (1980) (section 552.108 is designed to protect investigative techniques and procedures used in law enforcement), 143 (1976) (disclosure of specific operations or specialized equipment directly related to investigation or detection of crime may be excepted). Section 552.108(b)(1) is not applicable, however, to generally known policies and procedures. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 at 2-3 (Penal Code provisions, common law rules, and constitutional limitations on use of force not protected), 252 at 3 (governmental body failed to indicate why investigative procedures and techniques requested were any different from those commonly known). In Open Records Decision No. 506 (1988), this office determined that the statutory predecessor to section 552.108(b) excepted from disclosure "cellular mobile phone numbers assigned to county officials and employees with specific law enforcement responsibilities." ORD 506 at 2. We noted that the purpose of the cellular telephones was to ensure immediate access to individuals with specific law enforcement responsibilities and that public access to these numbers could interfere with that purpose. *Id.*

You state the information you marked under section 552.108(b)(1) reveals locations and names of law enforcement personnel; details of law enforcement facilities; and network and computer information. Additionally, you inform us the cellular telephone numbers of law enforcement officers you marked are used to communicate for law enforcement purposes. You assert release of the information at issue would interfere with law enforcement personnel's duties of law enforcement and crime prevention. Further, you state release of the information would jeopardize officer safety. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have established the release of some of the information at issue would interfere with law enforcement. Accordingly, the district attorney's office may withhold the law enforcement officers' cellular telephone numbers you marked and the information we

marked under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code. However, we find you have not demonstrated any of the remaining information at issue would interfere with law enforcement or crime prevention. Thus, the district attorney's office may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.108(b)(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. Section 552.101 encompasses information protected by other statutes. As part of the Texas Homeland Security Act (the "HSA"), 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 418.176 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 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 418.181 of the Government Code provides as follows:

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 relate to a governmental body's security concerns does not make the 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 confidentiality statute, a governmental body asserting section 418.181 must adequately explain how the responsive information falls within the scope of the provision. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must explain how claimed exception to disclosure applies).

You state portions of the remaining information pertain to facilities used by county law enforcement personnel for the purpose of preventing acts of terrorism and criminal activity, and assert release of this information could be used in planning potential acts of terrorism

or violence. Upon review, however, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue relates to staffing requirements or tactical methods of an emergency response provider, consists of a list or compilation of pager or telephone numbers of an emergency response provider, or identifies the technical details of particular vulnerabilities of critical infrastructure to an act of terrorism. *See id.* § 421.001 (2) (defining “critical infrastructure” to include “all public or private assets, systems, and functions vital to the security, governance, public health and safety, economy, or morale of the state or the nation”). Consequently, the information at issue is not confidential under section 418.181 of the Government Code. Thus, the district attorney’s office may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.176 or 418.181 of the Government Code.

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 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. Section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which 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. 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 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 no portion of the remaining information is subject to section 552.102(a) of the Government Code, and the district attorney’s office may not withhold any of the remaining information on that basis.

As previously noted, section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which is subject to the two-part test discussed above. *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 intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. This office has found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally private. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 600* (1992) (employee’s designation of retirement beneficiary, choice of insurance carrier, election of optional coverages, direct deposit authorization, forms allowing employee to allocate pretax compensation to group insurance, health care or dependent care), 545 (1990) (deferred compensation information, participation in voluntary

investment program, election of optional insurance coverage, mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history), 523 (1989) (common-law privacy protects credit reports, financial statements, and other personal financial information), 423 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow). 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 that the fact that a public employee is sick is public information, but specific information about illnesses is excepted from disclosure. *See* ORD 470 at 4. The court of appeals has concluded public citizens' dates of birth are protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *See Paxton v. City of Dallas*, No. 03-13-00546-CV, 2015 WL 3394061, at \*3 (Tex. App.—Austin May 22, 2015, pet. denied) (mem. op.).

Upon review, we find some of the remaining information, which we marked, satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Thus, the district attorney's office must withhold the information we marked and all public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find no portion of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing information of an individual that is of no legitimate public concern. Accordingly, the district attorney's office may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of common-law privacy.

You raise section 552.101 in conjunction with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 ("HIPAA"), 42 U.S.C. §§ 1320d-1320d-8. At the direction of Congress, the Secretary of Health and Human Services ("HHS") promulgated regulations setting privacy standards for medical records, which HHS issued as the Federal Standards for Privacy of Individually Identifiable Health Information. *See* Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996, 42 U.S.C. § 1320d-2 (Supp. IV 1998) (historical & statutory note); Standards for Privacy of Individually Identifiable Health Information, 45 C.F.R. pts. 160, 164 ("Privacy Rule"); *see also* Attorney General Opinion JC-0508 at 2 (2002). These standards govern the releasability of protected health information by a covered entity. *See* 45 C.F.R. pts. 160, 164. Under these standards, a covered entity may not use or disclose protected health information, except as provided by parts 160 and 164 of the Code of Federal Regulations. *See id.* § 164.502(a).

This office has addressed the interplay of the Privacy Rule and the Act. In Open Records Decision No. 681 (2004), we noted section 164.512 of title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations provides a covered entity may use or disclose protected health information to the extent such use or disclosure is required by law and the use or disclosure complies with and is limited to the relevant requirements of such law. *See id.* § 164.512(a)(1). We further noted the Act "is a mandate in Texas law that compels Texas governmental bodies to disclose information to the public." ORD 681 at 8; *see also* Gov't Code §§ 552.002, .003, .021. Therefore, we held the disclosures under the Act come within section 164.512(a). Consequently, the Privacy Rule does not make information confidential for the purpose of section 552.101 of the Government Code. *See Abbott v. Tex. Dep't of Mental Health & Mental Retardation*, 212 S.W.3d 648 (Tex. App.—Austin 2006, no pet.); ORD 681 at 9; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 478 (1987) (as general rule, statutory confidentiality

requires express language making information confidential). Thus, because the Privacy Rule does not make confidential information that is subject to disclosure under the Act, the district attorney's office may not withhold any portion of the information at issue on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses chapter 611 of the Health and Safety Code. Section 611.002 pertains to mental health records and provides, in pertinent part,

(a) Communications between a patient and a professional, and records of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient that are created or maintained by a professional, are confidential.

(b) Confidential communications or records may not be disclosed except as provided by Section 611.004 or 611.0045.

Health & Safety Code § 611.002(a)-(b); *see id.* § 611.001 (defining "patient" and "professional"). Section 611.001 defines a "professional" as (1) a person authorized to practice medicine, (2) a person licensed or certified by the state to diagnose, evaluate or treat mental or emotional conditions or disorders, or (3) a person the patient reasonably believes is authorized, licensed, or certified. *See id.* § 611.001(2). Sections 611.004 and 611.0045 provide for access to mental health records only by certain individuals. *See id.* §§ 611.004, .0045; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 565 (1990). Upon review, we find you have not demonstrated any portion of the remaining information consists of a mental health record for purposes of chapter 611 of the Health and Safety Code. Accordingly, the district attorney's office 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 Medical Practice Act ("MPA"), subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code, which governs release of medical records. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides, in relevant part, the following:

(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.

Occ. Code § 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; Open Records Decision No. 598 (1991). However, 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). Upon review, we find you have not demonstrated any of the remaining information is subject to the MPA, and the district attorney's office 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 section 181.006 of the Health and Safety Code. Section 181.006 states,

For a covered entity that is a governmental unit, an individual's protected health information:

(1) includes any information that reflects that an individual received health care from the covered entity; and

(2) is not public information and is not subject to disclosure under [the Act].

*Id.* § 181.006. Section 181.001(b)(2)(A) defines "[c]overed entity" as "any person who

(A) for commercial, financial, or professional gain, monetary fees, or dues, or on a cooperative, nonprofit, or pro bono basis, engages, in whole or in part, and with real or constructive knowledge, in the practice of assembling, collecting, analyzing, using, evaluating, storing, or transmitting protected health information. The term includes a business associate, health care payer, governmental unit, information or computer management entity, school, health researcher, health care facility, clinic, health care provider, or person who maintains an Internet site[.]

Health & Safety Code § 181.001(b)(2)(A). You do not inform us the district attorney's office is a covered entity for purposes of section 181.006 of the Health and Safety Code. Thus, we find you have failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information is subject to section 181.006 of the Health and Safety Code, and the district attorney's office may not withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code exempts from public disclosure the home address, home telephone number, emergency contact information, and social security number of a peace officer, as well as information that reveals whether the peace officer has family members, regardless of whether the peace officer complies with sections 552.024 and 552.1175 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(2). Section 552.117(a)(2) applies to peace officers as defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. We note section 552.117 also encompasses a personal cellular

telephone number, unless the cellular service is paid for by a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-7 (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). Upon review, we find some of the remaining information, which we marked, may be subject to section 552.117(a)(2). We note some of the individuals whose information is at issue may be currently licensed peace officers as defined by article 2.12. Accordingly, to the extent the information we marked pertains to individuals who are currently licensed peace officers as defined by article 2.12, the district attorney's office must withhold the information under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code; however, the district attorney's office may only withhold the marked cellular telephone numbers if the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. Conversely, if the information we marked pertains to individuals who are not currently licensed peace officers as defined by article 2.12, the information at issue may not be withheld under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code.

If the information we marked under section 552.117 pertains to individuals who are not currently licensed peace officers, then 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 a current or former employee 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). As noted above, section 552.117 also encompasses a personal cellular telephone number, unless the cellular service is paid for by a governmental body. *See* ORD 506 at 5-7. 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 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 are not currently licensed peace officers as defined by article 2.12, and these individuals timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the district attorney's office must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the district attorney's office may only withhold the marked cellular telephone numbers if a governmental body did not pay for the cellular telephone service. Conversely, to the extent the individuals at issue are not currently licensed peace officers as defined by article 2.12 and did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024, the district attorney's office may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.117(a)(1). In either event, we find you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.117 to any portion of the remaining information. Accordingly, the district attorney's office may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.117 of the Government Code.

Section 552.1175 of the Government Code protects the home address, home telephone number, emergency contact information, date of birth, social security number, and family member information of certain individuals, when that information is held by a governmental body in a non-employment capacity and the individual elects to keep the information confidential. Gov't Code § 552.1175. Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.1175 to any of the remaining information. Therefore, the district attorney's office may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.1175 of the Government Code.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's license, driver's license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release. *See id.* § 552.130. Upon review, we find the information we marked consists of motor vehicle record information subject to section 552.130. Therefore, the district attorney's office must withhold the motor vehicle record information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. However, you have failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information at issue is subject to section 552.130. Thus, the district attorney's office may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides, "[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential." *Id.* § 552.136(b). Section 552.136(a) defines "access device" as "a card, plate, code, account number, personal identification number, electronic serial number, mobile identification number, or other telecommunications service, equipment, or instrument identifier or means of account access that alone or in conjunction with another access device may be used to . . . obtain money, goods, services, or another thing of value [or] initiate a transfer of funds other than a transfer originated solely by paper instrument." *Id.* § 552.136(a). Upon review, we find the district attorney's office must withhold the information we marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. However, we find you have not demonstrated the remaining information you marked consists of access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. Accordingly, the district attorney's office may not withhold any of the remaining information you marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

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). 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 district attorney's office must withhold the e-mail

addresses you marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners of the e-mail addresses affirmatively consent to their public disclosure or subsection (c) applies.

Section 552.147 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the social security number of a living person. *Id.* § 552.147. Accordingly, the district attorney's office may withhold the social security numbers you marked under section 552.147 of the Government Code.

We note some of the remaining information at issue appears to 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 information we marked and the IP addresses, usernames, and passwords you marked and indicated are not subject to the Act, and the district attorney's office is not required to release this information in response to this request for information. The district attorney's office may withhold the information you marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. With the exception of the information we marked for release, the district attorney's office may withhold the information you marked and indicated under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code. The district attorney's office may withhold the information we marked and indicated under section 552.111 of the Government Code. With the exception of the information we marked for release, the district attorney's office must withhold the information you marked under section 552.139 of the Government Code. The district attorney's office must withhold the identifying information of the undercover law enforcement officers you marked under section 552.152 of the Government Code. The district attorney's office may withhold the information you marked under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. The district attorney's office may withhold the law enforcement officers' cellular telephone numbers you marked and the information we marked under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code. The district attorney's office must withhold the information we marked and all public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. To the extent the information we marked pertains to individuals who are currently licensed peace officers as defined by article 2.12, the district attorney's office must withhold the information under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code; however, the district attorney's office may only withhold the marked cellular telephone numbers if the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. To the extent the individuals whose information is at issue are not currently licensed peace officers as defined by article 2.12, and these individuals timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the district attorney's office must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the district attorney's office may only withhold the marked cellular telephone numbers if a governmental body did not pay for the cellular telephone service. The district attorney's office must withhold the information we

marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The district attorney's office must withhold the information we marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The district attorney's office must withhold the e-mail addresses you marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners of the e-mail addresses affirmatively consent to their public disclosure or subsection (c) applies. The district attorney's office may withhold the social security numbers you marked under section 552.147 of the Government Code. The district attorney's office must release the remaining information; however, the district attorney's office may only release any information subject to copyright 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](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,



Kieran Hillis  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

KH/gw

Ref: ID# 755082

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

c: 2 Third Parties  
(w/o enclosures)