



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 2, 2022

Ms. Alexandra Williams  
Counsel for the Grapevine-Colleyville Independent School District  
Cantey Hanger L.L.P.  
600 West 6th Street, Suite 300  
Fort Worth, Texas 76102-3685

OR2022-34031

Dear Ms. Williams:

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# 982053 (GCISD Internal Ref. No. P000771-081722).

The Grapevine-Colleyville Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for e-mails sent to, sent from, or about a named district trustee. You state the district has released some information to the requestor. We understand the district will redact information pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), section 1232g of title 20 of the United States Code.<sup>1</sup> See Gov't Code §§ 552.026 (incorporating FERPA into the Act), .114 (excepting from disclosure "student records"); Open Records Decision No. 539 (1990) (determining the same analysis applies under section 552.114 of the Government Code and FERPA). You state the district will withhold certain information pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).<sup>2</sup> You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

---

<sup>1</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 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/sites/default/files/files/divisions/open-government/20060725-USDO E-FERPA.pdf>.

<sup>2</sup> Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain information without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

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 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 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 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 Exhibit 3 consists of communications involving attorneys for the district and district representatives that were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the district. You also state these communications were intended to be, and have 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 Exhibit 3 under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code exempts 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 information protected by other statutes, such as section 37.108 of the Education Code, which provides, in part:

(a) Each school district or public junior college district shall adopt and implement a multihazard emergency operations plan for use in the district’s facilities. The plan must address mitigation, preparedness, response, and recovery as defined by the commissioner of education or commissioner of higher education in conjunction with the governor’s office of homeland security. The plan must provide for:

- (1) district employee training in responding to an emergency;
- (2) if the plan applies to a school district, mandatory school drills and exercises to prepare district students and employees for responding to an emergency;
- (3) measures to ensure coordination with the Department of State Health Services and local emergency management agencies, law enforcement, health departments, and fire departments in the event of an emergency; and
- (4) the implementation of a safety and security audit as required by Subsection (b).

(b) At least once every three years, each school district or public junior college district shall conduct a safety and security audit of the district’s facilities. To the extent possible, a district shall follow safety and security audit procedures developed by the Texas School Safety Center or a comparable public or private entity.

(c-1) Except as provided by Subsection (c-2), any document or information collected, developed, or produced during a safety and security audit conducted under Subsection (b) is not subject to disclosure under [the Act].

(c-2) A document relating to a school district’s or public junior college district’s multihazard emergency operations plan is subject to disclosure if the document enables a person to:

- (1) verify that the district has established a plan and determine the agencies involved in the development of the plan and the agencies coordinating with the district to respond to an emergency, including the Department of State Health Services, local emergency services

agencies, law enforcement agencies, health departments, and fire departments;

(2) verify that the district's plan was reviewed within the last 12 months and determine the specific review dates;

(3) verify that the plan addresses the five phases of emergency management under Subsection (a);

(4) verify that district employees have been trained to respond to an emergency and determine the types of training, the number of employees trained, and the person conducting the training;

(5) verify that each campus in the district has conducted mandatory emergency drills and exercises in accordance with the plan and determine the frequency of the drills;

(6) if the district is a school district, verify that the district has established a plan for responding to a train derailment if required under Subsection (d);

(7) verify that the district has completed a safety and security audit under Subsection (b) and determine the date the audit was conducted, the person conducting the audit, and the date the district presented the results of the audit to the district's board of trustees;

(8) verify that the district has addressed any recommendations by the district's board of trustees for improvement of the plan and determine the district's progress within the last 12 months; and

(9) if the district is a school district, verify that the district has established a visitor policy and identify the provisions governing access to a district building or other district property.

Educ. Code § 37.108(a)-(b), (c-1), (c-2). We understand Exhibit 4 was developed, collected, or produced during a safety and security audit conducted under section 37.108(b). *See id.* § 37.108(b). We note, however, some of the information at issue would enable a person to verify the information described in section 37.108(c-2). Accordingly, this information is not subject to section 37.108(c-1) and the district may not withhold it under section 552.101 on that basis. However, the district must withhold the remaining portions of Exhibit 4 under section 552.101 of the Government Code and section 37.108(c-1) of the Education Code.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> As our ruling is dispositive, we do not address your arguments against disclosure of this information.

You claim the information subject to section 37.108(c-2), is excepted from disclosure under the Texas Homeland Security Act (the “HSA”). Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the HSA. As part of the HSA, sections 418.176 through 418.182 were added to chapter 418 of the Government Code as part of the HSA. Section 418.177 of the Government Code provides the following:

Information is confidential if the information:

- (1) is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental entity for the purpose of preventing, detecting, or investigating an act of terrorism or related criminal activity; and
- (2) relates to an assessment by or for a governmental entity, or an assessment that is maintained by a governmental entity, of the risk or vulnerability of persons or property, including critical infrastructure, to an act of terrorism or related criminal activity.

Gov’t Code § 418.177. Section 418.181 of the Government Code provides the following:

Those documents or portions of documents in the possession of a governmental entity are confidential if they identify the technical details of particular vulnerabilities of critical infrastructure to an act of terrorism.

*Id.* § 418.181; *see also id.* § 421.001(2) (defining “critical infrastructure” to include all public or private assets, systems, and functions vital to security, governance, public health and safety, economy, or morale of state or nation). The fact that information may relate to a governmental body’s security concerns does not make the information *per se* confidential under the HSA. *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 HSA 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 argue the information subject to section 37.108(c-2) is collected, assembled, and maintained for the purpose of preventing, detecting, or investigating an act of terrorism or related criminal activity. You further explain this information is part of a safety and security vulnerabilities assessment that the district is required to conduct to identify and prevent potential hazards or threats to safety. Based on your representations and our review, we agree the remaining information relates to an assessment of the vulnerabilities of persons or property to an act of terrorism or related criminal activity and is maintained by the district for the purpose of preventing, detecting, responding to, or investigating an

act of terrorism or related criminal activity. Accordingly, the district must generally withhold the information subject to section 37.108(c-2) of the Education Code under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.177 of the Government Code.

You assert the information subject to section 37.108(c-2) identifies the technical details of particular vulnerabilities of critical infrastructure to an act of terrorism. Upon review, we find you demonstrated the information subject to section 37.108(c-2) identifies the technical details of particular vulnerabilities of critical infrastructure to an act of terrorism. Thus, the district must generally withhold the information subject to section 37.108(c-2) of the Education Code under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.181 of the Government Code.

Thus, there is a conflict between the confidentiality provided under sections 418.177 and 418.181 of the Government Code and the information made public by section 37.108(c-2). Where general and specific statutes are in irreconcilable conflict, the specific provision typically prevails as an exception to the general provision unless the general provision was enacted later and there is clear evidence the legislature intended the general provision to prevail. *See id.* § 311.026(b); *Horizon/CMS Healthcare Corp. v. Auld*, 34 S.W.3d 887, 901 (Tex. 2000) (“more specific statute controls over the more general”); *Cuellar v. State*, 521 S.W.2d 211 (Tex. Crim. App. 1975) (under well-established rule of statutory construction, specific statutory provisions prevail over general ones). Section 418.177 generally pertains to information which was collected, assembled, or is maintained by or for the district for the purpose of preventing, detecting, or investigating an act of terrorism or related criminal activity and relates to an assessment of the risk or vulnerability of persons or property, including critical infrastructure, to an act of terrorism or related criminal activity. Section 418.181 generally pertains to information which would identify the technical details of particular vulnerabilities of critical infrastructure to an act of terrorism. However, section 37.108(c-2) specifically provides access to information that would enable a person to verify the information described in these sections. Therefore, we find section 37.108(c-2) of the Education Code is more specific than, and prevails over, the general confidentiality provided under sections 418.177 and 418.181 of the Government Code. Additionally, we note section 37.108 is the later enacted statute. *See Gov’t Code* § 311.025(a) (if statutes enacted at different sessions of legislature are irreconcilable, statute latest in enactment prevails). Thus, the district may not withhold any portion of the information subject to section 37.108(c-2) of the Education Code under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.177 or section 418.181 of the Government Code.

In summary, the district may withhold Exhibit 3 under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. With the exception of the information subject to section 37.108(c-2) of the Education Code, which must be released, the district must withhold Exhibit 4 under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 37.108(c-1) of the Education Code.

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,

Gerald A. Arismendez  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

GAA/jxd

Ref: ID# 982053

c: Requestor