



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 1, 2016

Ms. Ana Vieira Ayala  
Senior Attorney & Public Information Coordinator  
Office of General Counsel  
The University of Texas System  
201 West Seventh Street  
Austin, Texas 78701-2902

OR2016-07336

Dear Ms. Ayala:

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# 603914 (OGC No. 166875).

The University of Texas System (the "system") received a request for information pertaining to the requestor, including the requestor's personnel file. You state you have released some information with redactions pursuant to sections 552.130(c) and 552.147(b) of the Government Code, and Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).<sup>1</sup> You claim some of the submitted information is not subject to the Act. You also claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.107, 552.108, 552.122,

---

<sup>1</sup>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 552.147(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 under the Act. *Id.* § 552.147(b). Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain information, including: an e-mail address of a member of the public under section 552.137 of the Government Code, and L-2 and L-3 declarations under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1701.306(b) of the Occupations Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

and 552.139 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

You state, and we agree, the submitted information contains peace officers' Texas Commission on Law Enforcement ("TCOLE") identification numbers. Section 552.002(a) of the Government Code defines "public information" as information 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

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

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." *Id.* § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses laws that make criminal history record information ("CHRI") confidential. CHRI generated by the National Crime Information Center or by the Texas Crime Information Center is confidential under federal and state law. Title 28, part 20 of the Code of Federal Regulations governs the release of CHRI that states obtain from the federal government or other states. Open Records Decision No. 565 at 7 (1990). The federal

regulations allow each state to follow its individual law with respect to CHRI it generates. *Id.* at 10-12. Section 411.083 of the Government Code deems confidential CHRI the Department of Public Safety (“DPS”) maintains, except DPS may disseminate this information as provided in chapter 411, subchapter F or subchapter E-1 of the Government Code. *See* Gov’t Code § 411.083. Sections 411.083(b)(1) and 411.089(a) of the Government Code authorize a criminal justice agency to obtain CHRI; however, a criminal justice agency may not release CHRI except to another criminal justice agency for criminal justice purposes. *See id.* § 411.089(b)(1). Other entities specified in chapter 411 of the Government Code are entitled to obtain CHRI from DPS or another criminal justice agency; however, those entities may not release CHRI except as provided by chapter 411. *See generally id.* §§ 411.090-127. Upon review, we find the information you have marked consists of confidential CHRI. Accordingly, the system must withhold the information you have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.083 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information made confidential by other statutes, such as the Medical Practice Act (“MPA”), subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code, which governs release of medical records. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides, in relevant part:

- (a) A communication between a physician and a patient, relative to or in connection with any professional services as a physician to the patient, is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.
- (b) A record of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that is created or maintained by a physician is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.
- (c) A person who receives information from a confidential communication or record as described by this chapter, other than a person listed in Section 159.004 who is acting on the patient’s behalf, may not disclose the information except to the extent that disclosure is consistent with the authorized purposes for which the information was first obtained.

Occ. Code § 159.002(a)-(c). Information that is subject to the MPA includes both medical records and information obtained from those medical records. *See id.* §§ 159.002, .004. This office has concluded the protection afforded by section 159.002 extends only to records created by either a physician or someone under the supervision of a physician. Some of the information at issue consists of a report of the results of a drug test. We note section 159.001 of the MPA defines “patient” as “a person who, to receive medical care, consults with or is seen by a physician.” *Id.* § 159.001(3). Because the individual at issue in the report did not receive medical care in the administration of the drug test, in this instance, the individual is

not a patient for purposes of section 159.002. Upon review, we find the information we have marked consists of a record of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that was created by a physician or someone under the supervision of a physician. Therefore, the system must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA.<sup>2</sup> However, we find you have not demonstrated the remaining information constitutes medical records for purposes of the MPA, and the system may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). Under the common-law right of privacy, an individual has a right to be free from the publicizing of private affairs in which the public has no legitimate concern. *Id.* at 682. In considering whether a public citizen's date of birth is private, the Third Court of Appeals looked to the supreme court's rationale in *Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts v. Attorney General of Texas*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). *Paxton v. City of Dallas*, No. 03-13-00546-CV, 2015 WL 3394061, at \*3 (Tex. App.—Austin May 22, 2015, pet. denied) (mem. op.). The supreme court concluded public employees' dates of birth are private under section 552.102 of the Government Code because the employees' privacy interest substantially outweighed the negligible public interest in disclosure.<sup>3</sup> *Texas Comptroller*, 354 S.W.3d at 347-48. Based on *Texas Comptroller*, the court of appeals concluded the privacy rights of public employees apply equally to public citizens, and thus, public citizens' dates of birth are also protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *City of Dallas*, 2015 WL 3394061, at \*3. Thus, the system must withhold the date of birth you have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with 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 the system

---

<sup>2</sup>We note this ruling does not affect an individual's right of access to his or her own medical records from the physician who provided treatment under the Medical Practice Act (the "MPA"), subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code. See Occ. Code §§ 159.004, .005, .006; cf. *Abbott v. Tex. State Bd. of Pharmacy*, 391 S.W.3d 253 (Tex. App.—Austin 2012, no pet.) (MPA does not provide patient general right of access to his or her medical records from governmental body responding to a request for information under the Public Information Act).

<sup>3</sup>Section 552.102(a) 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).

must withhold the dates of birth you have marked 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. 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)(A), (B), (C), (D), (E). 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.* 503(b)(1), 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).

The system states the information you have marked consists of communications involving system attorneys, system representatives, and other system employees and officials. The system states the communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the system and these communications have remained confidential. Upon review, we find the system has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Thus, the system may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.122 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure “[a] test item developed by a . . . governmental body[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.122(b). In Open Records Decision No. 626 (1994), this office determined the term “test item” in section 552.122 includes “any standard means by which an individual’s or group’s knowledge or ability in a particular area is evaluated,” but does not encompass evaluations of an employee’s overall job performance or suitability. ORD 626 at 6. The question of whether specific information falls within the scope of section 552.122(b) must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *Id.* Traditionally, this office has applied section 552.122 where release of “test items” might compromise the effectiveness of future examinations. *Id.* at 4-5; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 118 (1976).

You state the information at issue consists of questions and answers from quizzes and tests administered by the system’s Office of Director of Police (“ODOP”) to officers in training. The system contends release of the information at issue would “compromise ODOP’s ability to test for skills expected of the officers” because the system reuses the information at issue. Based on your representations and our review, we conclude the information we have marked qualifies as “test items” under section 552.122(b) of the Government Code. We also find the release of the individual’s answers to these questions would tend to reveal the questions themselves. Therefore, the system may withhold the questions and answers we have marked under section 552.122(b) of the Government Code.<sup>4</sup> However, we find the remaining information at issue is not subject to section 552.122(b), and the system may not withhold it on that basis.

Section 552.108(b) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[a]n internal record or notation of a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that is maintained for internal use in matters relating to law enforcement or prosecution . . . if (1) release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.108(b)(1). This section is intended to protect “information which, if released, would permit private citizens to anticipate weaknesses in a police department, avoid detection, jeopardize officer safety, and generally undermine police efforts to effectuate the laws of this State.” *City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320, 327 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.). This office has concluded this provision protects certain kinds of information, the disclosure of which might compromise the security or operations of a law enforcement agency. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 at 3-4 (1989) (detailed guidelines regarding police department’s use of force policy), 508 at 3-4 (1988) (information relating to future transfers of prisoners), 413 (1984) (sketch showing security measures for forthcoming execution). However, to claim this aspect of section 552.108 protection a governmental body must meet its burden of explaining how and why release of the information at issue would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. Open Records Decision No. 562 at 10 (1990). Further, commonly known policies and techniques

---

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

may not be withheld under section 552.108. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 at 2-3 (former section 552.108 does not protect Penal Code provisions, common-law rules, and constitutional limitations on use of force), 252 at 3 (1980) (governmental body did not meet burden because it did not indicate why investigative procedures and techniques submitted were any different from those commonly known with law enforcement and crime prevention). To prevail on its claim that section 552.108(b)(1) excepts information from disclosure, a law-enforcement agency must do more than merely make a conclusory assertion that releasing the information would interfere with law enforcement. The determination of whether the release of particular records would interfere with law enforcement is made on a case-by-case basis. Open Records Decision No. 409 at 2 (1984). You assert the information at issue “relates to specific training modules that target key skills, through mock scenarios, that ODOP believes are essential to carrying out its duties.” You further state “knowledge of what officer trainees focus on during their training . . . could make [the] system vulnerable and hinder its ability to effectively secure its campuses.” However, upon review, we find the system has failed to demonstrate the information at issue would interfere with law enforcement. Thus, none of the information at issue may be withheld under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.139(b)(3) of the Government Code provides “a photocopy or other copy of an identification badge issued to an official or employee of a governmental body” is confidential. Gov’t Code § 552.139(b)(3). Upon review, we find no portion of the information at issue consists of a copy of an identification badge issued to an official or employee of a governmental body. Accordingly, the system may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.139(b)(3) of the Government Code.

In summary, the TCOLE identification numbers are not subject to the Act and need not be released to the requestor. The system must withhold the information you have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.083 of the Government Code. The system must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA. The system must withhold the date of birth you have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The system must withhold the dates of birth you have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. The system may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The system may withhold the questions and answers we have marked under section 552.122(b) of the Government Code. The system must release the remaining information.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup>We note the requestor has a special right of access to some of the information being released in this instance. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.023(a) (governmental body may not deny access to person to whom information relates, or that party’s representative, solely on grounds that information is considered confidential by privacy principles).

You ask this office to issue a previous determination permitting the system to withhold public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. *See id.* § 552.301(a) (allowing governmental body to withhold information subject to previous determination); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001). After due consideration, we have decided to grant your request on this matter. Therefore, this letter ruling authorizes the system to withhold the dates of birth of public citizens under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. We note common-law privacy is a personal right that lapses at an individual's death. *See Moore v. Charles B. Pierce Film Enters., Inc.*, 589 S.W.2d 489, 491 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1979, writ ref'd n.r.e.); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 620 (1993), 272 (1981), 192 (1978). Therefore, this previous determination authorizes the system to withhold dates of birth of living individuals. This previous determination is not applicable to dates of birth belonging to deceased individuals. We also note a person or a person's authorized representative has a special right of access under section 552.023 of the Government Code to information that is protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect the person's privacy interests. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual requests information concerning himself). Therefore, this previous determination is not applicable to dates of birth requested by a person or the authorized representative of a person whose date of birth is at issue. Furthermore, information filed with a court is not protected by common-law privacy. *See* Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(17); *Star-Telegram v. Walker*, 834 S.W.2d 54 (Tex. 1992) (common-law privacy not applicable to court-filed document). Accordingly, this previous determination is not applicable to dates of birth contained in court-filed documents. So long as the elements of law, fact, and circumstances do not change so as to no longer support the findings set forth above, the system need not ask for a decision from this office again with respect to this type of information. *See* ORD 673 at 7-8 (listing elements of second type of previous determination under Gov't Code § 552.301(a)).

You also ask this office to issue a previous determination permitting the system to withhold the dates of birth of current and former employees of the system when the dates of birth are held in an employment context under section 552.102 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(a) (allowing governmental body to withhold information subject to previous determination); ORD 673. After due consideration, we have decided to grant the system's request on this matter. Therefore, this letter ruling authorizes the system to withhold the dates of birth of current and former system employees when the dates of birth are held in an employment context under section 552.102 of the Government Code. As noted above, the right to privacy is a personal right that lapses at an individual's death. *See Moore*, 589 S.W.2d at 491; *see also* ORDs 620, 272, 192. Therefore, this previous determination authorizes the system to withhold dates of birth of living current and former employees of the system. This previous determination is not applicable to dates of birth belonging to deceased former employees of the system. We also note a person or a person's authorized representative has a special right of access under section 552.023 of the Government Code to information that is protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect the

person's privacy interests. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a); ORD 481 at 4. Therefore, this previous determination is not applicable to a date of birth requested by a person or the authorized representative of a person whose date of birth is at issue. So long as the elements of law, fact, and circumstances do not change so as to no longer support the findings set forth above, the system need not ask for a decision from this office again with respect to this type of information. *See* ORD 673 at 7-8.

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 [http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl\\_ruling\\_info.shtml](http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml), or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Cristian Rosas-Grillet  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CRG/bw

Ref: ID# 603914

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)