



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

June 29, 2005

Mr. Andrew A. Chance
Ashcraft Law Firm, PC
3900 Republic Center
325 North St. Paul Street
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2005-05792

Dear Mr. Chance:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 227086.

North Central Texas College (the "college"), which you represent, received a request for five categories of information. You claim that the requested 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 representative sample of information.¹ We have also received and considered comments submitted by the requestor. *See Gov't Code § 552.304* (providing that interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

In addition to making a request under the Public Information Act, the requestor is seeking the same information that is the subject of his Public Information Act request in his capacity as a member of the college's Board of Regents. In Attorney General Opinion JM-119 (1983), this office addressed a similar situation where a member of the board of trustees of

¹ 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.

the Alamo Community College District (the “district”) requested access to certain records held by the district. This office concluded that:

. . . when a trustee of a community college district, acting in his official capacity, requests information maintained by the district, he is not a member of the ‘public’ for purposes of the Open Records Act. On the contrary, he is a member of the board which at least constructively maintains all records in the district’s possession Because such a trustee is not merely a member of the public, his request for records in the district’s possession cannot, in our opinion, be treated as a request for information under the Open Records Act.

Attorney General Opinion JM-119 at 2 (1983) (emphasis in original), *reaffirmed in* Attorney General Opinion JC-0120 (1999). Attorney General Opinion JM-119 further concludes that although the Public Information Act governs the release of information to members of the general public,

. . . [i]t cannot, in our view, control the right of access of a member of a governmental body to information in that governmental body’s possession. Since the governmental body – in this instance the board of trustees of the district – at least constructively maintains records in the district’s possession, we believe it logically follows that a member of that board has an inherent right of access to such records, *at least when he requests them in his official capacity.*

Id. at 3 (emphasis added). Consequently, whether the requestor in this instance has a right of access to the requested information depends on whether he is seeking the information in his official capacity. From the clear and precise wording of his request for the information at issue “as a board member,” we conclude that he is seeking the information in his official capacity. Consequently, we conclude that the requestor, as a member of the Board of Regents requesting this information in his official capacity, has an inherent right of access to the information and it must be provided to him. The release of this information in this specific instance does not constitute a release to the general public and, as such, the college waives none of the possible exceptions to the disclosure of this information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 666 at 4 (2000) (municipality’s disclosure to a municipally-appointed citizen advisory board does not constitute a release to the public as contemplated under section 552.007 of the Government Code). Because the release of this information to a member of the Board of Regents is not a release to the public, the requestor must be cautious in maintaining the documents in the same manner as they are maintained by the college.² *See*

² As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the college’s arguments against disclosure.

generally Gov't Code § 552.352 (criminal penalties imposed for release of confidential information).

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Tex. Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code

§ 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Lauren E. Kleine
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LEK/jev

Ref: ID# 227086

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Steve Gaylord
2436 FM 2848
Valley View, Texas 76272
(w/o enclosures)

Dr. Eddie C. Hadlock
North Central Texas College
1525 West California Street
Gainesville, Texas 76240-4699
(w/o enclosures)