



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 21, 2019

Mr. Aesil Kim  
Assistant General Counsel  
University of North Texas System  
Account Number 62048  
1155 Union Circle #310907  
Denton, Texas 76203-5017

OR2019-29649

Dear Mr. Kim:

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# 792380 (UNT Dallas PIR No. 000681)

The University of North Texas at Dallas (the "university") received a request for eight categories of information pertaining to a specified meeting, communications, and contracts during particular periods of time, as well as information pertaining to a named employee.<sup>1</sup> You state the university has redacted information pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(a).<sup>2</sup> You also indicate the university will

---

<sup>1</sup> You state the university sought and received clarification of the request for information. See Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (stating if information requested is unclear to governmental body or if large amount of information has been requested, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify or narrow request, but may not inquire into purpose for which information will be used); *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380 (Tex. 2010) (holding when governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification of unclear or overbroad request for public information, ten-business-day period to request attorney general opinion is measured from date request is clarified or narrowed).

<sup>2</sup> The 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 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. The DOE has determined FERPA determinations must be made by the educational authority in possession of the educational records. We have posted a copy of the letter from the DOE on the Attorney General's website at

redact information subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code pursuant to section 552.024(c) of the Government Code, access device numbers pursuant to section 552.136(c) of the Government Code, and certain information pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).<sup>3</sup> You state you have released some information. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>4</sup>

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. This section encompasses information protected by other statutes, including section 51.971 of the Education Code. Section 51.971 of the Education Code provides in relevant part the following:

(a) In this section:

(1) “Compliance program” means a process to assess and ensure compliance by the officers and employees of an institution of higher education with applicable laws, rules, regulations, and policies, including matters of:

(A) ethics and standards of conduct;

(B) financial reporting;

(C) internal accounting controls; or

(D) auditing.

---

<https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/sites/default/files/files/divisions/open-government/20060725-USDO-E-FERPA.pdf>.

<sup>3</sup> Section 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). Section 552.136(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 552.136(b) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See id.* § 552.136(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.136(e). *See id.* § 552.136(d), (e). Open Records Decision No. 684 serves as a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See* ORD 684.

<sup>4</sup> We assume that the “representative sample” of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

(2) "Institution of higher education" has the meaning assigned by Section 61.003.

...

(e) Information is excepted from disclosure under [the Act] if it is collected or produced:

(1) in a compliance program investigation and releasing the information would interfere with an ongoing compliance investigation[.]

Educ. Code § 51.971(a), (e)(1). The university states it is an institution of higher education for purposes of section 61.003 of the Education Code. *See id.* § 51.971(a)(2). The university indicates Representative Sample A pertains to an ongoing compliance investigation conducted by the university's human resources department as part of the university's compliance program, and was collected or produced in that investigation. You state the investigation was initiated in order to assess and ensure compliance with all applicable laws, rules, regulations, and policies. Based on your representations and our review, we agree the information at issue pertains to the university's compliance program for purposes of section 51.971. The university further indicates release of the information at issue would interfere with the ongoing investigation. Based on these representations and our review, we conclude the university must withhold Representative Sample A under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 51.971(e)(1) of the Education Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information protected by other statutes, such as 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. Section 418.182 provides in part:

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

Gov't Code § 418.182(a). The fact that information may relate to a governmental body's security concerns does not make the information *per se* confidential under the Texas Homeland Security Act. *See* Open Records Decision No. 649 at 3 (1996) (language of confidentiality provision controls scope of its protection). Furthermore, the mere recitation by a governmental body of a statute's key terms is not sufficient to demonstrate the applicability of a claimed provision. As with any exception to disclosure, a governmental body asserting one of the confidentiality provisions of the Texas Homeland Security Act must adequately explain how the responsive records fall within the scope of the claimed

provision. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must explain how claimed exception to disclosure applies).

You assert the information you marked relates to a security system used to protect the university from an act of terrorism or related criminal activity. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the information at issue 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. Accordingly, the university must withhold the information you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.182 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. 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 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), 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 some of the information at issue satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the university must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find you failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue 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.

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. 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. *Id.*; see also *City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351 (Tex. 2000) (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking). 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).

Further, section 552.111 does not protect facts and written observations of facts and events severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.); see 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).

You seek to withhold the information you marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. You state the information at issue consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations of officials of the university regarding policymaking matters. Upon review, we find the university may withhold the information you marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

In summary, the university must withhold Representative Sample A under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 51.971(e)(1) of the Education Code. The university must withhold the information you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.182 of the Government Code. The university must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The university may withhold the information you marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The university 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 <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open-government/members-public/what-expect-after-ruling-issued> or call the OAG's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Public Information Act may be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the OAG, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Erin Groff  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

EMG/be

Ref: ID# 792380

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)