



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 25, 2019

Mr. Christopher St James  
Assistant General Counsel  
Spring Independent School District  
16717 Ella Boulevard  
Houston, Texas 77090

OR2019-10947

Dear Mr. St James:

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# 761678 (PIR No. 842).

The Spring Independent School District (the "district") received three requests from the same requestor for information pertaining to the requestor and information pertaining to specified investigations. You state you 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 information.

Initially, 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.<sup>1</sup> Consequently, state and local educational authorities that receive a request for education records from a

---

<sup>1</sup>A copy of this letter may be found on the Office of the Attorney General's website at <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/sites/default/files/files/divisions/open-government/20060725-USDOE-FERPA.pdf>

member of the public under the Act must not submit education records to this office in unredacted form, that is, in a form in which “personally identifiable information” is disclosed. *See* 34 C.F.R. § 99.3 (defining “personally identifiable information”). You have submitted unredacted education records for our review. Because our office is prohibited from reviewing these education records to determine whether appropriate redactions under FERPA have been made, we will not address the applicability of FERPA to any of the submitted records. *See* 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(a)(1)(A). Such determinations under FERPA must be made by the educational authority in possession of the education records. However, we will consider your arguments against disclosure of the submitted information.

Next, we must address the procedural obligations of the district under section 552.301 of the Government Code, which prescribes the procedures that a governmental body must follow in asking this office to decide whether requested information is excepted from public disclosure. Pursuant to section 552.301(b), a governmental body must ask for a decision from this office and state the exceptions that apply within ten business days of receiving the written request. Gov’t Code § 552.301(b). The district informs us it received the requests for information on January 30, 2019, and January 31, 2019. Thus, the district’s ten-business-day deadlines to request a ruling were February 13, 2019, and February 14, 2019, respectively. We note the envelope in which the district originally submitted the information required by section 552.301(b) was returned to the district for insufficient postage, and the district again submitted the required information to this office. The envelope in which the district provided the information required by section 552.301(b) is postmarked February 19, 2019. *See id.* § 552.308(a)(1) (describing rules for calculating submission dates of documents sent via first class United States mail, common or contract carrier, or interagency mail). Section 552.308 of the Government Code provides, when a submission within a specified time period is required under the Act, the time requirement is met if the submission is sent by first class mail “with postage . . . prepaid” and the postmark date is within the required time period. *See id.* § 552.308(a). Therefore, the district failed to comply with the procedural requirements mandated by section 552.301(b).

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body’s failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless there is a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ). Because section 552.101 of the Government Code can provide a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness, we will address the applicability of this section to the information at issue. However, we find you have failed to establish a compelling reason to address your remaining exception.

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 section 418.182 of the Government Code, which was added to chapter 418 of the Government Code as part of the Texas Homeland Security Act ("HSA"). Section 418.182(a) of the Government Code provides in relevant part, "information . . . in the possession of a governmental entity that relates to the specifications, operating procedures, or location of a security system used to protect public or private property from an act of terrorism or related criminal activity is confidential." *Id.* § 418.182(a). The fact that information may be related to a security system does not make the information *per se* confidential under section 418.182. *See* Open Records Decision No. 649 at 3 (1996) (language of confidentiality provision controls scope of its protection). Furthermore, the mere recitation by a governmental body of a statute's key terms is not sufficient to demonstrate the applicability of a claimed provision. As with any confidentiality provision, a governmental body asserting section 418.182 must adequately explain how the responsive information falls within the scope of the statute. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must explain how claimed exception to disclosure applies).

The submitted information includes a security surveillance video recording from a district school. The district explains the disclosure of this information would reveal the location, quality, clarity, camera angle, and coverage of this security surveillance camera. The district states this surveillance camera is part of the district's security system and is used to protect public and private property from acts of terrorism. Upon review, we find the submitted video recording 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. *See Tex. Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Abbott*, 310 S.W.3d 670 (Tex. App.—Austin 2010, no pet.) (finding confidential under section 418.182 of the HSA video recording containing images recorded by security cameras in Texas Capitol hallway because specifications of security system included cameras' capabilities and video recording demonstrated those capabilities through characteristics, quality, and clarity of images recorded). Accordingly, the district must withhold the submitted video recording under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.182(a) of the Government Code.

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. This office has determined common-law privacy generally protects the identities of juvenile offenders. *See* Open Records Decision No. 394 (1983); *cf.* Fam. Code § 58.008(b). In this instance, the remaining information contains the identifying information of individuals who may have been juvenile offenders. However, because the remaining information does not reflect the age of these individuals, we must rule conditionally.

Therefore, to the extent the information we marked pertains to an offender who was between the ages of ten and sixteen at the time of the alleged conduct, the district must withhold the information we marked pertaining to this offender under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, to the extent the information we marked does not identify an offender who was between the ages of ten and sixteen at the time of the alleged conduct, the district may not withhold this information on that basis.

In summary, the district must withhold the submitted video recording under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.182(a) of the Government Code. To the extent the information we marked pertains to an offender who was between the ages of ten and sixteen at the time of the alleged conduct, the district must withhold the information we marked pertaining to this offender under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The district must release the remaining information.<sup>2</sup>

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,



Meagan J. Conway  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

MC/jxd

---

<sup>2</sup>We note the requestor has a right of access to some of the information being released in this instance. See Gov't Code § 552.023(a) (governmental body may not deny access to person to whom information relates or person's agent on ground that information is considered confidential by privacy principles); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individuals request information concerning themselves). Thus, if the district receives another request for the same information from a different requestor, the district must again seek a decision from this office.

Ref: ID# 761678

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)