



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 22, 2020

Mr. Mario Perez Jr.
Counsel for the Edgewood Independent School District.
J. Cruz & Associates, LLC
216 West Village Boulevard, Suite 202
Laredo, Texas 78041

OR2020-32041

Dear Mr. Perez:

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# 857700 (ORR 16).

The Edgewood Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for personnel records of a former district police officer. You claim portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.107, 552.111, 552.117, 552.136, and 552.147 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information. We have also received and considered comments from the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Initially, we note the submitted information includes completed evaluations subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a)(1) provides for the required public disclosure of "a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body[,]" unless it is excepted by section 552.108 of the Government Code or is made confidential under the Act or other law. *Id.* § 552.022(a)(1). Although you assert some of the information at issue is excepted from disclosure under section 552.111 of the Government Code, this section is discretionary and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary

exceptions), 470 at 7 (1987) (statutory predecessor to section 552.111 subject to waiver). Therefore, the district may not withhold the information subject to section 552.022(a)(1) under section 552.111. However, as section 552.101 of the Government Code protects information made confidential under law, we will consider your arguments under section 552.101 of the Government Code for the information at issue. We will also consider your arguments for the information not subject to section 552.022(a)(1) of the Government Code.

Next, we address your assertion that some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure because it is subject to the confidentiality provisions of a settlement agreement. We note information is not confidential under the Act simply because the party submitting the information anticipates or requests that it be kept confidential. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976). In other words, a governmental body cannot, through an agreement or contract, overrule or repeal provisions of the Act. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 3 (1990) (“[T]he obligations of a governmental body under [the predecessor to the Act] cannot be compromised simply by its decision to enter into a contract.”), 203 at 1 (1978) (mere expectation of confidentiality by person supplying information does not satisfy requirements of statutory predecessor to Gov’t Code § 552.110). Consequently, unless the information falls within an exception to disclosure, the district must release it, notwithstanding any expectations or agreement specifying otherwise.

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 information protected by other statutes, such as 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). You state the information you indicated is subject to the FMLA. Based on your representations and our review, we find the information at issue is confidential under section 825.500 of title 29 of the Code of Federal Regulations. We understand none of the release provisions of the FMLA apply to this information. Accordingly, the district must withhold the information you indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the FMLA.¹

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code. Section 6103(a) renders tax return information confidential. Attorney General Opinion H-1274 (1978) (tax returns); Open Records Decision No. 600 (1992) (W-4 forms). Section 6103(b) defines the term “return information” as the following:

[A] taxpayer’s identity, the nature, source, or amount of his income, payments, receipts, deductions, exemptions, credits, assets, liabilities, net worth, tax liability, tax withheld, deficiencies, overassessments, or tax payments . . . or any other data, received by, recorded by, prepared by, furnished to, or collected by the Secretary [of the Treasury] with respect to a return or with respect to the determination of the existence, or possible existence, of liability . . . for any tax, penalty, interest, fine, forfeiture, or other imposition, or offense[.]

26 U.S.C. § 6103(b)(2)(A). Federal courts have construed the term “return information” expansively to include any information gathered by the Internal Revenue Service regarding a taxpayer’s liability under title 26 of the United States Code. *See Mallas v. Kolak*, 721 F. Supp. 748, 754 (M.D.N.C. 1989), *dismissed in part, aff’d in part, vacated in part, and remanded*, 993 F.2d 1111 (4th Cir. 1993). Accordingly, the district must withhold the submitted W-4 form pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code.²

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 21.355 of the Education Code. This section provides, in relevant part, “[a] document evaluating the performance of a teacher or administrator is confidential and is not subject to disclosure under [the Act].” Educ. Code § 21.355(a). The Third Court of Appeals has concluded a written reprimand constitutes an evaluation for purposes of section 21.355 because “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

¹ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

² As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

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 “administrator” means a person who is required to and does in fact hold a 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. *See id.* at 4. Upon review, we find the information you indicated does not consist of a document evaluating the performance of an administrator for the purposes of section 21.355. Thus, the district may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.101 on that basis.

Section 552.102(b) of the Government Code exempts from public disclosure “a transcript from an institution of higher education maintained in the personnel file of a professional public school employee[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.102(b). We must consider whether the Legislature intended the term “professional public school employee” in section 552.102(b) to include a police officer employed by the district. Section 552.102(b) does not define “professional public school employee.” When construing a statute, a court may consider the circumstances under which the Legislature enacted the statute as well as its legislative history. *Id.* § 311.023(2), (3); *City of Rockwall v. Hughes*, 246 S.W.3d 621, 626 n.6 (Tex. 2008). In 1989, the Legislature passed Senate Bill 404 (“S.B. 404”) as an amendment to the Act to include the statutory predecessor to section 552.102(b). The Senate sponsor of S.B. 404, Senator Don Henderson, stated before the Senate Committee for State Affairs the bill was a response to “people trying to get past a teacher’s degree, past a teacher’s hiring, . . . [and] past a school board’s determination that a teacher was qualified to teach[.]” Hearing on S.B. 404 Before the Senate Comm. for State Affairs, 71st Leg., R.S. (February 27, 1989) (statement of Senator Henderson) (recording available from Senate Staff Services Office). During the Senate floor debate of the bill, Senator Henderson further questioned the purpose of “any citizen being able to look at any teacher’s transcript” because “there are several other means by which we say teachers are qualified to teach in this state.” *Id.*; *see also* Debate on Tex. S.B. 404 on the Floor of the Senate, 71st Leg., R.S. (March 13, 1989) (statement of Senator Henderson describing S.B. 404 as relating to privacy of a teacher’s transcript; statement of Senator Caperton summarizing S.B. 404 as balancing public’s right to know with teacher’s right of privacy) (recording available from Senate Staff Services Office). In addition, Representative Paul J. Hilbert, the House sponsor of S.B. 404, stated during the debate on the House floor that the statute was intended to protect teachers’ college transcripts. *See* Debate on Tex. S.B. 404 on the Floor of the House, 71st Leg., R.S. (May 10 and 11, 1989) (statements of Representative Hilbert introducing S.B. 404 as applying to transcripts of teachers) (recording available from House Video/Audio Services). Therefore, we believe the legislative history of section 552.102(b) shows the Legislature enacted the predecessor statute to section 552.102(b) to protect the transcripts of only professional educators, rather than the transcripts of all public school employees. *See* Open Records Decision No. 526 (1989) (addressing predecessor statute in light of previous lack of exception for “qualifications of professional public school employees *to teach*”) (emphasis added). Thus, we find the district has not established the former district police officer whose information is at issue is a professional public-school employee. Accordingly, the district may not withhold the college transcripts you indicated under section 552.102(b) of the Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 470, 467 (1987) (public has legitimate interest in job qualifications, including college transcripts, of public employees).

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). Accordingly, the district must withhold the date of birth you indicated under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code.

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 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. *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 indicated is a communication between an attorney for the district and district administrators and officials in their capacities as clients. You state this communication was made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the district. You state the communication was intended to be, and has remained, confidential. Based on 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 indicated under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.³

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). When determining if an interagency memorandum is excepted from disclosure under section 552.111, we must consider whether the agencies between which the memorandum is passed share a privity of interest or common deliberative process with regard to the policy matter at issue. *See* Open Records Decision No. 561 at 9 (1990).

You seek to withhold some of the remaining information under section 552.111 of the Government Code on the basis of the deliberative process privilege. You state the information you indicated includes recommendations and advice pertaining to district staffing and safety planning and is unrelated to routine administrative and personnel matters. Based on your representations and our review, we find the information we marked constitutes policymaking advice, opinion, and recommendation. As such, the district may

³ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

withhold the information we marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, we find the remaining information at issue consists of information that is administrative or purely factual in nature or does not rise to the level of policymaking. Thus, we find you failed to demonstrate the remaining information reveals advice, opinions, or recommendations that pertain to policymaking. Therefore, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts 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. In this instance, however, it is unclear whether the individual whose information is at issue is currently a licensed peace officer as defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Accordingly, to the extent the individual whose information is at issue is a currently licensed peace officer as defined by article 2.12, the district must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code.

If the marked information pertains to an individual who is no longer a licensed peace officer, 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 or official of a governmental body who requests this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code, except as provided by section 552.024(a-1). *See id.* §§ 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 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 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 is no longer a peace officer as defined by article 2.12 and to the extent this individual 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.

We note some of the remaining information, which we marked, may relate to an individual who is a currently licensed peace officer of another law enforcement agency. 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.⁴ See Gov't Code § 552.1175. Section 552.1175 applies, in part, to “peace officers as defined by Article 2.12, Code of Criminal Procedure[.]” *Id.* § 552.1175(a)(1). Thus, if the individual whose information is at issue is a currently licensed peace officer who elected to restrict access to his information in accordance with section 552.1175(b), then the district must withhold the information we marked under section 552.1175 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); see *id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). Accordingly, the district must withhold the information we marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

Section 552.147(a-1) of the Government Code provides, “[f]he social security number of an employee of a school district in the custody of the district is confidential.” *Id.* § 552.147(a-1). Thus, section 552.147(a-1) makes the social security numbers of school district employees confidential, without such employees being required to first make a confidentiality election under section 552.024 of the Government Code. *Id.* § 552.024(a-1) (school district may not require employee or former employee of district to choose whether to allow public access to employee’s or former employee’s social security number). Reading sections 552.024(a-1) and 552.147(a-1) together, we conclude section 552.147(a-1) makes confidential the social security numbers of both current and former school district employees. Thus, the district must withhold any social security numbers in the remaining information under section 552.147(a-1) 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.*, 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 highly intimate or embarrassing. See Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (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), 523 (1989) (common-law privacy protects credit report, financial statements, and other personal financial information), 373 (1983) (sources of income not related to financial transaction between individual and governmental body protected under common-law privacy). We also note the public generally has a legitimate interest in information that relates to public employment and public employees. See Open Records Decision Nos. 562

⁴ The 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.

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), 542 (1990), 470 at 4 (1987) (public has legitimate interest in job qualifications and performance of public employees), 444 at 5-6 (1986) (public has legitimate interest in knowing reasons for dismissal, demotion, promotion, or resignation of public employees). Upon review, we find some of the remaining information meets the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the district must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.⁵ However, we find you failed to demonstrate 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.

In summary, the district must withhold the information you indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the FMLA. The district must withhold the submitted W-4 form pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code. The district must withhold the date of birth you indicated under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. The district may withhold the information you indicated under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The district may withhold the information we marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. To the extent the individual whose information is at issue is a currently licensed peace officer as defined by article 2.12, the district must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code. To the extent the individual whose information is at issue is no longer a peace officer as defined by article 2.12 and to the extent this individual 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. If the individual whose information is at issue is a currently licensed peace officer who elected to restrict access to his information in accordance with section 552.1175(b) of the Government Code, then the district must withhold the information we marked under section 552.1175 of the Government Code. The district must withhold the information we marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The district must withhold any social security numbers in the remaining information under section 552.147(a-1) of the Government Code. The district must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The remaining information must be released.

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

⁵ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

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,

Michelle Garza
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MRG/rm

Ref: ID# 857700

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Third Party
(w/o enclosures)