



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 2, 2019

Ms. Amber K. King
General Counsel
Lake Travis Independent School District
3322 Ranch Road 620 South
Austin, Texas 78738

OR2019-18236

Dear Ms. King:

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# 773273 (Request Nos. 040819-13E9/DL 5871 and 040819-13F4/DL 5882).

The Lake Travis Independent School District (the "district") received two requests from the same requestor for information pertaining to the district's legal expenses during a specified time period and information related to resignations and/or terminations during a specified time period. The district states it is releasing some information to the requestor. We understand the district has redacted information subject to section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code pursuant to section 552.024(c)(2) of the Government Code.¹ We also understand the district has redacted student-identifying information from the submitted documents pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), section 1232g of title 20 of the United States Code.² The district claims portions of the submitted

¹Section 552.024(c)(2) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact information protected by section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code without the necessity of requesting a decision under the Act if the current or former employee or official to whom the information pertains timely chooses not to allow public access to the information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.024(c)(2). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with subsections 552.024(c-1) and (c-2). *See id.* § 552.024(c-1)-(c-2).

²The United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office (the "DOE") has informed this office FERPA does not permit state and local educational authorities to disclose to this office, without parental or student consent, unredacted, personally identifiable information contained in education records for the purpose of our review in the open records ruling process under the Act. The DOE has determined FERPA determinations must be made by the educational authority in possession of the education records. A copy of this letter may be found on the Office of the Attorney General's website: <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/files/og/20060725usdoe.pdf>.

information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code and privileged under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. Additionally, the district states it notified Sherry Baker and Jamie Downey of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information at issue should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (providing that interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released). We have received comments from Sherry Baker.³ We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, as the district acknowledges, the submitted information includes attorney fee bills that are subject to section 552.022(a)(16) of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a)(16) provides for required public disclosure of "information that is in a bill for attorney's fees and that is not privileged under the attorney-client privilege" unless the information is expressly confidential under the Act or other law. *Id.* § 552.022(a)(16). The Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Evidence are "other law" for the purposes of section 552.022. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 337 (Tex. 2001). Accordingly, we will consider the district's claim under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 for the information it marked.

Texas Rule of Evidence 503(b)(1) provides as follows:

A client has a privilege to refuse to disclose and to prevent any other person from disclosing confidential communications made to facilitate the rendition of professional legal services to the client:

(A) between the client or the client's representative and the client's lawyer or the lawyer's representative;

(B) between the client's lawyer and the lawyer's representative;

(C) by the client, the client's representative, the client's lawyer, or the lawyer's representative to a lawyer representing another party in a pending action or that lawyer's representative, if the communications concern a matter of common interest in the pending action;

(D) between the client's representatives or between the client and the client's representative; or

(E) among lawyers and their representatives representing the same client.

TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). A communication is "confidential" if it is not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made in furtherance of the

³As of the date of this letter, we have not received comments from the remaining notified party explaining why the information at issue should not be released.

rendition of professional legal services to the client or those reasonably necessary for the transmission of the communication. *Id.* 503(a)(5).

Thus, in order to withhold attorney-client privileged information from disclosure under rule 503, a governmental body must: (1) show the document is a communication transmitted between privileged parties or reveals a confidential communication; (2) identify the parties involved in the communication; and (3) show the communication is confidential by explaining it was not intended to be disclosed to third persons and it was made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 (2002). Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the entire communication is confidential under rule 503 provided the client has not waived the privilege or the communication does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in rule 503(d). *See Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, orig. proceeding). We note communications with third parties with whom a governmental entity shares a privity of interest are protected. Open Records Decision Nos. 464 (1987), 429 (1985).

The district asserts the portions of the submitted fee bills it marked should be withheld under rule 503. The district states the submitted fee bills include privileged attorney-client communications between the district's attorneys, district representatives, and district officials and staff in their capacities as clients. The district also states the communications at issue were made for the purpose of the rendition of legal services to the district. The district indicates the communications at issue have not been, and were not intended to be, disclosed to third parties. Based on the district's representations and our review, we find the district established some of the information it marked constitutes attorney-client communications under rule 503. Accordingly, with the exception of the information we marked for release, the district may withhold the information it marked pursuant to rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. However, we find some of the communications at issue are with individuals the district has not demonstrated are privileged parties. Further, we find some of the information at issue does not document a communication. We note an entry stating a memorandum or e-mail was prepared, drafted, or reviewed does not demonstrate the document was communicated to the client. Therefore, the district may not withhold any portion of the information we marked for release under rule 503.

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 the Family and Medical Leave Act (the "FMLA"). *See* 29 U.S.C. §§ 2601 *et seq.* Section 825.500 of chapter V of title 29 of the Code of Federal Regulations identifies the record-keeping requirements for employers that are subject to the FMLA. Subsection (g) of section 825.500 states:

[r]ecords and documents relating to medical certifications, recertifications or medical histories of employees or employees' family members, created for purposes of FMLA, shall be maintained as confidential medical records in separate files/records from the usual personnel files. . . . If the [Americans

with Disabilities Act (the “ADA”)], as amended, is also applicable, such records shall be maintained in conformance with ADA confidentiality requirements . . . , except that:

- (1) Supervisors and managers may be informed regarding necessary restrictions on the work or duties of an employee and necessary accommodations;
- (2) First aid and safety personnel may be informed (when appropriate) if the employee’s physical or medical condition might require emergency treatment; and
- (3) Government officials investigating compliance with FMLA (or other pertinent law) shall be provided relevant information upon request.

29 C.F.R. § 825.500(g). Upon review, we find we find the district failed to demonstrate the remaining information is confidential under section 825.500 of title 29 of the Code of Federal Regulations. Therefore, the district 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 ADA. *See* 42 U.S.C. §§ 12101 *et seq.* Title I of the ADA provides that information about the medical conditions and medical histories of applicants or employees must be (1) collected and maintained on separate forms, (2) kept in separate medical files, and (3) treated as a confidential medical record. Information obtained in the course of a “fitness for duty examination” conducted to determine whether an employee is still able to perform the essential functions of his or her job is to be treated as a confidential medical record as well. *See* 29 C.F.R. § 1630.14(c); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 641 (1996). Furthermore, the federal Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (the “EEOC”) has determined that medical information for the purposes of the ADA includes “specific information about an individual’s disability and related functional limitations, as well as general statements that an individual has a disability or that an ADA reasonable accommodation has been provided for a particular individual.” *See* Letter from Ellen J. Vargyas, Legal Counsel, EEOC, to Barry Kearney, Associate General Counsel, National Labor Relations Board, 3 (Oct. 1, 1997). Federal regulations define “disability” for the purposes of the ADA as “(i) a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more of the major life activities of the individual; (ii) a record of such an impairment; or (iii) [b]eing regarded as having such an impairment[.]” 29 C.F.R. § 1630.2(g)(1). The regulations further provide that physical or mental impairment means: (1) any physiological disorder, or condition, cosmetic disfigurement, or anatomical loss affecting one or more of the following body systems: neurological, musculoskeletal, special sense organs, respiratory (including speech organs), cardiovascular, reproductive, digestive, genito-urinary, hemic and lymphatic, skin, and endocrine; or (2) any mental or psychological disorder, such as mental retardation, organic brain syndrome, emotional or mental illness, and specific learning disabilities. *See id.* § 1630.2(h). Upon review, we find the district

failed to demonstrate the ADA is applicable to any portion of the remaining information. Therefore, the district may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the ADA.

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). Additionally, the Third Court of Appeals has concluded a written reprimand constitutes an evaluation for purposes of section 21.355, as it “reflects the principal’s judgment regarding [a teacher’s] actions, gives corrective direction, and provides for further review.” *Abbott v. North East Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 212 S.W.3d 364 (Tex. App.—Austin 2006, no pet.). 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. We also determined for purposes of section 21.355, an “administrator” 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.*

The district contends the information in Exhibit D consists of confidential evaluations of an administrator and/or teachers by the district. Additionally, Sherry Baker contends some of the information at issue consists of a confidential evaluation of an administrator and/or teacher by the district. The district states, and provides documentation showing, the individuals at issue were certified as teachers or as an administrator and were acting as teachers or an administrator at the time the information was prepared. However, upon review, we find the district and Sherry Baker failed to demonstrate the information at issue consists of “[a] document evaluating the performance of a teacher or administrator” as contemplated by section 21.355. *See* ORD 643 at 3. Therefore, the district may not withhold the information in Exhibit D under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education 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. 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, however, the public generally has a legitimate interest in information relating to public employment and public employees. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 9 (information

revealing that employee participates in group insurance plan funded partly or wholly by governmental body is not excepted from disclosure), 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), 444 (1986) (public has legitimate interest in knowing reasons for dismissal, demotion, promotion, or resignation of public employee), 423 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow). Furthermore, information pertaining to leave of public employees is generally a matter of legitimate public interest. *See* Open Records Decision No. 336 at 2 (1982) (names of employees taking sick leave and dates of sick leave taken not private). Upon review, we find the district failed to demonstrate any portion of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Therefore, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

As noted above, we understand the district redacted information subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code as permitted by section 552.024(c) of the Government Code. We note the remaining information contains additional information subject to section 552.117.⁴ Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the current and former home addresses and telephone numbers, emergency contact information, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former employees or officials of a governmental body who request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code, except as provided by section 552.024(a-1). Gov't Code §§ 552.117(a)(1), .024. Section 552.024(a-1) of the Government Code provides, "[a] school district may not require an employee or former employee of the district to choose whether to allow public access to the employee's or former employee's social security number." *Id.* § 552.024(a-1). Thus, the district may only withhold under section 552.117 the home address and telephone number, emergency contact information, and family member information of a current or former employee or official of the district who requests this information be kept confidential under section 552.024. 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 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 the 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 individual whose information is at issue 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 individual at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024, the district may not withhold the information under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code.

⁴The 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).

In summary, with the exception of the information we marked for release, the district may withhold the information it marked pursuant to rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. To the extent the individual whose information is at issue 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. 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,



James M. Graham
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JMG/gw

Ref: ID# 773273

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

c: 2 Third Parties
(w/o enclosures)