



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 7, 2020

Mr. Darin Darby
Counsel for the San Antonio Independent School District
Escamilla & Poneck, LLP
700 North Saint Mary's Street, Suite 850
San Antonio, Texas 78205

OR2020-10443

Dear Mr. Darby:

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# 821393.

The San Antonio Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for a named district employee's personnel file, including information related to a specified incident. We understand you will redact student-identifying information pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), section 1232g of title 20 of the United States Code.¹ See Gov't Code §§ 552.026 (incorporating FERPA into the Act), .114 (excepting from disclosure "student records"); Open Records Decision No. 539 (1990)

¹ The United States Department of Education Family Compliance Office (the "DOE") has informed this office FERPA does not permit state and local educational authorities to disclose to this office, without parental 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. We have posted a copy of the letter from the DOE to this office on the Attorney General's website: <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/sites/default/files/files/divisions/open-government/20060725-SDOE-FERPA.pdf>

(determining the same analysis applies under section 552.114 of the Government Code and FERPA). You indicate the district will withhold information pursuant to sections 552.130(c), 552.136(c), and 552.147(b) of the Government Code and pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 670.² You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, and 552.107 of the Government Code.³ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.⁴

Initially, we note the submitted information includes an officer's Texas Commission on Law Enforcement ("TCOLE") identification number. Section 552.002(a) of the Government Code defines "public information" as the following:

[I]nformation 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

² Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.130(e). *See id.* § 552.130(d), (e). Section 552.136(c) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact, without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office, the information described in section 552.136(b). *Id.* § 552.136(c); *see also id.* § 552.136(d)-(e) (requestor may appeal governmental body's decision to withhold information under section 552.136(c) to attorney general and governmental body withholding information pursuant to section 552.136(c) must provide certain notice to requestor). Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office. *See id.* § 552.147(b). Open Records Decision No. 670 is a previous determination authorizing all governmental bodies that are subject to the Act to withhold home addresses and telephone numbers, personal cellular telephone numbers, personal pager numbers, social security numbers, and family member information of peace officers without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code.

³ Although you also raise section 552.022 of the Government Code, we note this section is not an exception to disclosure. Rather, section 552.022 enumerates categories of information that are not excepted from disclosure unless they are made confidential under the Act or other law. *See* Gov't Code § 552.022.

⁴ 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.

(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). 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. We understand the officer's TCOLE identification number is a unique computer-generated numbers assigned to the peace officer for identification in TCOLE's electronic database, and may be used as an access device number on the TCOLE website. Thus, we find the officer's TCOLE number does not constitute public information under section 552.002 of the Government Code. Therefore, the officer's TCOLE number is not subject to the Act and need not be released to the requestor.⁵

Section 552.101 of the Government Code exempts from public disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." *Id.* § 552.101. This section encompasses section 143.089 of the Local Government Code. The application of chapter 143 of the Local Government Code is delineated in section 143.002 of that code, which provides:

(a) This chapter applies only to a municipality:

(1) that:

(A) has a population of 10,000 or more;

(B) has a paid fire department or police department; and

(C) has voted to adopt this chapter or the law codified by this chapter; or

(2) whose election to adopt this chapter and whose acts subsequent to that election were validated by the law enacted by House Bill 822, Acts of the 73rd Legislature, Regular Session, 1993.

⁵ As we are able to make this determination, we need not address your arguments against disclosure of this information.

Local Gov't Code § 143.002(a). Thus, chapter 143 of the Local Government Code applies only to civil service municipalities that have voted to adopt the chapter. The district is not a municipality. Furthermore, you have not explained how section 143.089 of the Local Government Code is applicable to information held by the district. Accordingly, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089(g) of the Local 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. However, we note the public generally has a legitimate interest in information that relates to public employment and public employees. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 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), 470 at 4 (1987) (job performance does not generally constitute public employee's private affairs), 444 at 3 (1986) (public has obvious interest in information concerning qualifications and performance of law enforcement employees), 405 at 2 (1983) (manner in which public employee's job was performed cannot be said to be of minimal public interest), 329 (1982) (reasons for employee's resignation ordinarily not private). Upon review, we find no portion of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public concern, and the district may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of common-law privacy.

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). The Texas Supreme Court held section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). Upon review, we find no portion of the remaining information is subject to section 552.102(a) of the Government Code, and the district may not withhold it on that basis.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. *See* Gov't Code § 552.107(1). When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body has the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate that 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 a 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.*, 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 transit 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. *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 that 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 have indicated consists of communications involving attorneys for the district and district employees and officials in their capacities as clients. You state these communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the district. You further state these communications were intended to be, and have remained, confidential. Based upon these representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Accordingly, the district may withhold the information you have indicated under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

In summary, the officer’s TCOLE number does not constitute public information under section 552.002 of the Government Code, and it need not be released to the requestor. The district may withhold the information you have indicated under section 552.107(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 <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,

Tim Neal
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

TN/gw

Ref: ID# 821393

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)