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**ABUSE AND NEGLECT**

- N.D.A.G. 2003-O-10  
  September 4, 2003, to Tri-County Intervention, Inc.  
  Records of domestic and sexual assault confidential.

- N.D.A.G. 94-F-21  
  July 28, 1994, to Henry Wessman  
  Privileged medical records may be reviewed.

- N.D.A.G. 94-F-12.  
  April 5, 1994, to Henry Wessman  
  Information on institutional abuse.

- N.D.A.G. 94-F-03  
  January 27, 1994, to Henry Wessman  
  Disclosure of abuse and neglect records to federal officials.

- N.D.A.G. Letter  
  December 19, 1991, to Lloyd Omdahl  
  Exchange of abuse and neglect information between department and county social service boards.

- N.D.A.G. Letter  
  November 4, 1991, to Wayne Sanstead  
  Counseling session with student.

- N.D.A.G. 88-04  
  February 8, 1988, to Alan Duppler  
  Waiver of confidentiality by the subject of an abuse report.

- N.D.A.G. 84-31  
  August 17, 1984, to Tom Slorby  
  Providing abuse reports to defense counsel.

- N.D.A.G. 84-05  
  January 19, 1984, to James Twomey  
  Privileged medical records may be reviewed.

**AGRICULTURE**

- N.D.A.G. 2008-L-20  
  December 22, 2008, to Agriculture Commissioner  
  When a confidential record is required for the enforcement of the Pesticide Act, it is no longer confidential.

- N.D.A.G. 98-L-77  
  June 17, 1998, to Douglas Johansen  
  Field inspection applications and reports.

- N.D.A.G. 95-L-243  
  October 23, 1995, to Robert Peterson  
  Legal and tax assistance program records of the Credit Review Board and the Agriculture Commissioner.

- N.D.A.G. 78-154  
  May 4, 1978, to Myron Just  
  Potato council records.

**ATTORNEY WORK PRODUCT**

- N.D.A.G. 2021-O-05  
  May 13, 2021 to the City of Minot  
  A public entity cannot deny records under the attorney work product exemption to the open records laws if the documents do not meet all three of the elements for attorney work product.

- N.D.A.G. 2015-O-11  
  August 6, 2015, to Bismarck Public Schools  
  An analysis must take place before attorney billing statements can be redacted as “attorney work product.”
N.D.A.G. 2010-O-08  June 24, 2010, to Risk Management Division, Office of Management and Budget
In order for requested billing records to be considered "attorney work product," all three elements must exist under statute. Billing records of a pending claim against the state are exempt from open records law but may be released at discretion of public entity. Reasonable for entity to redact portions of billing statements that reveal attorney’s thought process for trial strategy and legal theories.

N.D.A.G. 2008-O-09  April 4, 2008, to Workforce Safety and Insurance
All three elements under N.D.C.C. § 44-04-19.1(6) must be present for a record to be exempt as “attorney work product.”

N.D.A.G. 2007-O-07  April 24, 2007, to Coolin Township
Records held by a private attorney working for a public entity are subject to the open records laws.

N.D.A.G. 2003-O-17  October 31, 2003, to City of Grand Forks
Attorney work product available for disclosure after litigation and administrative proceedings are complete.

N.D.A.G. 2002-O-05  April 1, 2002, to Fred Strege
Types of records protected.

N.D.A.G. 2002-O-01  January 10, 2002, to Wade Enget
Exemption is waived if shared with adversary.

N.D.A.G. 92-04  January 17, 1992, to Helen Tracy
Record prepared in anticipation of an adversarial administrative proceeding.

**AUDITOR, STATE**

N.D.A.G. 2001-L-36  September 14, 2001, to Robert Peterson
State auditor may not have access to or examine income tax returns except during an audit of the tax department under N.D.C.C. §§ 54-10-24 and 54-10-22.1.

N.D.A.G. 95-L-01  January 17, 1995, to Robert Peterson
Attorney billings to Protection and Advocacy Project.

N.D.A.G. 94-L-305  November 3, 1994, to Gordy Smith
Access to records of Protection and Advocacy Project for audit purposes.

**CITIES**

N.D.A.G. 2005-O-16  October 6, 2005, to Mayor of City of Oakes
Records given to council members by the mayor at a meeting.

N.D.A.G. 2005-O-01  January 10, 2005, to City of Napoleon
Arrangement to review city ordinances.

Access to city ordinances.

Release of attorney work product.

E-mails of city commissioners and the mayor.
N.D.A.G. 2002-O-09  September 17, 2002, to Van de Streek, Boughey, and Lee
City funds to reimburse Minot Area Chamber of Commerce Task Force.

N.D.A.G. 2002-L-41  July 12, 2002, to John Warcup
Real property appraisal.

Client files of city attorney.

N.D.A.G. 94-L-103  April 14, 1994, to Wayne Hokenson
Home improvement loan records and city checkbook (but see N.D.A.G.

N.D.A.G. 90-32  December 31, 1990, to Wayne Solberg
Field notes of city assessor.

Work papers of city assessor (but see N.D.A.G. 90-32 December 31 to
Wayne Solberg).

COMMERCIAL INFORMATION

SEE TRADE SECRETS

COMPUTER RECORDS

N.D.A.G. 2014-O-10  August 22, 2014, to North Dakota Department of Public Instruction
Emails sent from a public employee’s private email address that was not
set up at the direction of the employer, but still contain “public business”
are subject to open records law.

N.D.A.G. 2013-O-18  November 22, 2013, to North Dakota University Systems
It is not a violation of the open records law to use the search method
available on the public entity’s computer system. Employees of a public
entity would not know how to access “Recoverable Items” folder without
the extensive use of IT resources for which a charge may be assessed
pursuant to N.D.C.C. § 44-04-18(3).

N.D.A.G. 2011-O-12  August 30, 2011, to North Dakota State University
Excising computer records.

N.D.A.G. 2008-O-29  December 12, 2008, to North Dakota High School Activities Association
Availability of a record on a website does not nullify right of public to
receive copy.

N.D.A.G. 2008-O-17  July 15, 2008, to Adams County
If public records are maintained in a database, there must be some
meaningful way to access those records and make electronic copies.

Records maintained on a private, home computer by an agent of a public
entity relating to public business are subject to open records law.

Request for records in electronic format.

N.D.A.G. 2003-O-09  August 27, 2003, to North Dakota Game & Fish Department
Clarification reasonable for complicated request for electronic records.

E-mails of city commissioners and the mayor.
Excising computer records.

N.D.A.G. Letter September 10, 1992, to Helen Tracy
Raw data in a computer database is a record.

Lack of authority to charge for access to open records applies to computer records.

CORRECTIONS

SEE INMATE RECORDS

COUNTIES

Back-up preservation records of a county recorder that are stored offsite are not accessible for reproduction by the public under N.D.C.C. § 11-18-05(6) and the recorder does not have the discretion of allowing the public to duplicate the offsite records kept as the backup to the county records. N.D.C.C. § 11-18-05(5) gives county recorders the authority to develop procedures that promote the orderly duplication of the records including reasonable limits on the use of personal equipment in the recorder’s office that would interfere with others duplicating the records, damage the records, or impede the recorder’s ability to monitor how the records are handled.

N.D.A.G. 2004-O-23 October 27, 2004, to Stark County
Marriage licenses in county recorder’s office are open records.

N.D.A.G. 2004-O-05 February 17, 2004 to Grand Forks County Planning & Zoning Department
Records prepared by part-time county employee.

Wills deposited with county recorder.

N.D.A.G. 95-L-88 April 3, 1995, to James Odegard
Records of medical county coroner.

N.D.A.G. 94-L-90 April 4, 1994, to Jim Yockim
Settlement agreement with city official.

N.D.A.G. 94-L-52 March 7, 1994, to Ronald McBeth
Confidential records remain "public" records.

Noxious weed investigative reports.

N.D.A.G. 82-02 January 20, 1982, to Herbert Engberg
Reasonable office hours and fee for after-hours access can be set by the county.

N.D.A.G. 79-195 July 16, 1979, to James Purdy
Microfilming of county records by abstract company.

Sale of joint interest in microfilm records is not authorized.

N.D.A.G. 71-83 December 3, 1971, to Vincent LaQua
Transcript of coroner’s inquest is open.
N.D.A.G. 66-49  August 22, 1966, to Eugene Kruger
County officers who have possession of records and need office space.

N.D.A.G. 65-75  January 15, 1965, to John Alphson
County welfare board possesses public records and must be provided a suitable building at the county seat.

N.D.A.G. 51-37  June 14, 1951
Microfilming of county records.

COURTS

N.D.A.G. 2003-O-06  April 25, 2003, to Disciplinary Board of the ND Supreme Court
Records of Disciplinary Board and Judicial Conduct Commission are court records not subject to open records law.

N.D.A.G. 2002-L-19  April 1, 2002, to Kenneth Dalstad
Jurisdiction of juvenile court.

N.D.A.G. 2000-F-09  February 28, 2000, to Frank Wald
Definition of "juvenile court."

N.D.A.G. 99-L-71  August 6, 1999, to Wayne Stenehjem
Clerks and criminal history records.

N.D.A.G. 95-L-148  June 21, 1995, to Larry Quast
Courts have discretion over access to judicial records.

N.D.A.G. 94-F-18  July 1, 1994, to Jeff Rotering
Release of child support records by clerk of court.

N.D.A.G. Letter  September 15, 1992, to Ronald McBeth
Release of court records regarding child support.

N.D.A.G. 90-01  January 4, 1990, to Tom Slorby
Authority of school principal to review juvenile files.

Court criminal history records.

N.D.A.G. Letter  April 15, 1985, to Gail Hagerty
Access to conviction records.

N.D.A.G. Letter  December 27, 1984, Robert Manly
Access to probate records.

Adoption records.

N.D.A.G. 75-27  November 18, 1975, to Myron Atkinson, Jr.
County probate records.

N.D.A.G. 67-175  November 20, 1967, to John Alphson
Records of the psychiatric examinations of criminal defendants.

N.D.A.G. 49-149  May 27, 1949
Dockets of a justice of the peace.
CRIMINAL HISTORY RECORDS

SEE LAW ENFORCEMENT

DENIAL OF RECORDS

2021-O-09  September 3, 2021, to the Office of the Governor
The entity must communicate the delay to the requester. A three-week delay for 334 pages of readily available and uncomplicated records is unreasonable.

2021-O-05  May 13, 2021, to the City of Minot
A public entity cannot deny records under the attorney work product exemption to the open records laws if the documents do not meet all three of the elements for attorney work product.

N.D.A.G. 2020-O-10  September 30, 2020, to the Mandan Police Department
The entity violated the open records law when it did not explain its legal authority for redacting specific information, and exceeding the redaction allowed by law.

N.D.A.G. 2020-O-08  July 16, 2020, to Department of Health
When an entity has discretion to release information by law, it is not a violation of open records law when the entity uses its discretion to deny the release of the requested information.

N.D.A.G. 2020-O-01  February 6, 2020, to the North Dakota Board of Accountancy
Public entities must redact out portions of a record that contain confidential or exempt information, turning over the remaining public portion of the record subject to the request.

It was a violation of the law when the school district failed to inform the requestor that it was withholding a record in its response.

N.D.A.G. 2018-O-13  July 16, 2018, to City of Sentinel Butte
Public entities must inform a requestor that a record does not exist.

N.D.A.G. 2018-O-03  February 9, 2018, to City of Bismarck
A public entity can deny a request for records as active criminal intelligence and investigative information if the records are related to and still relevant to open cases.

N.D.A.G. 2015-O-17  October 19, 2015, to City of Dickinson
The public entity must inform the requestor if records do not exist.

N.D.A.G. 2015-O-14  August 14, 2015, to North Dakota State Board of Dental Examiners
A public entity may not deny a request for records that are in the hands of its “agent” relating to public business.

Allegations that a request for records was “too vague,” would be “cost prohibitive,” and a “strain on the personnel resources” to fulfill are not exceptions to the open records law and are not legal bases for denying a records request.

N.D.A.G. 2013-O-08  May 24, 2013, to North Dakota State University
Must provide requestor with analysis and correct legal reasoning for withholding entire records under FERPA.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Number</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N.D.A.G. 2011-O-11</td>
<td>August 24, 2011, to North Dakota Department of Human Services</td>
<td>Normally, the identity of the requestor and purpose of the request for open records of a public entity are irrelevant because the right to access public records belongs to all persons equally. The law, however, does not allow a party involved in litigation to circumvent the discovery process when seeking records from a public entity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.D.A.G. 2011-O-10</td>
<td>August 10, 2011, to Cass County Historical Society</td>
<td>Board violated law when did not provide requested e-mails and minutes, without explanation, within a reasonable time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.D.A.G. 2011-O-09</td>
<td>June 29, 2011, to Bank of North Dakota</td>
<td>Bank of North Dakota is a financial institution that is subject to statutory and federal law that requires it keep the “commercial or financial information of a customer” confidential.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.D.A.G. 2009-O-08</td>
<td>June 15, 2009, to University of North Dakota Alumni Association and University of North Dakota Foundation</td>
<td>Copy of a software contract should have been released to requester.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.D.A.G. 2008-O-27</td>
<td>December 1, 2008, to University of North Dakota</td>
<td>It was a violation of the open records law to inaccurately allege that FERPA prohibited the release of disciplinary records under any circumstance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.D.A.G. 2008-O-26</td>
<td>November 12, 2008, to CommunityWorks North Dakota, North Dakota Housing Finance Agency</td>
<td>Because CommunityWorks is not subject to the open records law, it did not violate the law by denying records. The ND Housing Finance Agency did not violate the law by refusing to provide records that are confidential by statute.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.D.A.G. 2008-O-19</td>
<td>July 15, 2008, to Foster County</td>
<td>The fact that the requester was not a licensed attorney and from an out of state business is not grounds to deny or delay providing records that are open to the public.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.D.A.G. 2008-O-17</td>
<td>July 15, 2008, to Adams County</td>
<td>A request for copies of records maintained in a database is not a request to create or compile records that do not exist.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.D.A.G. 2008-O-12</td>
<td>June 23, 2008, to Round Prairie Township</td>
<td>Even though a requester has access to requested minutes at a meeting, he is nonetheless entitled to copies of the minutes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.D.A.G. 2008-O-03</td>
<td>February 29, 2008, to Workforce Safety and Insurance</td>
<td>Video surveillance security tapes are exempt as part of security system plans.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.D.A.G. 2007-O-11</td>
<td>August 3, 2007, to City of Mandan</td>
<td>A public entity needs to respond to a request for records within a reasonable time, even if the response is that the records do not exist.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
March 1, 2007, to ND Department of Transportation
The DOT cannot deny a record because a requestor refuses to complete a form or explain the purpose behind the request.

February 12, 2007, to ND Department of Transportation
Access to an existing database.

October 4, 2006, to Williston Family Crisis Shelter
A public entity must describe the legal authority for denying a requested record.

July 25, 2006, to Wayne Samdahl, Pembina County Sheriff
A public entity must give an accurate reason for denial of a record.

May 15, 2006, to City of Grand Forks
Opinions, thoughts, or mental impressions are not records

May 4, 2006, to North Dakota Stockmen’s Association
Active criminal investigative information is exempt from the open records law.

February 21, 2006, to Bismarck-Mandan Orchestral Association
A record cannot be denied merely because it contains confidential information.

December 5, 2005, to Minto Special Assessment Commission
Entity’s agent has duty to honor request for copies.

October 6, 2005, to Mayor of City of Oakes
Marking record “confidential” not a basis for denial.

May 17, 2004, to Halliday Public School District
Written denial of records need not have specific legal authority.

December 1, 2003, to Department of Human Services
Entity asked for written request for records.

August 27, 2003, to North Dakota Game & Fish Department
When records are not available in requested format, identify to requestor what formats are available as soon as possible.

December 14, 2000, to Norbert Sickler
Sufficient description of legal basis for denial.

Denials of nonexistent records must be in writing.

March 3, 1998, to Norbert Sickler and Franklin Appledorn
A reasonable delay is not a denial.

February 20, 1998, to Glenn Giese and Lester Brackel
Denial must address all requested records which are not disclosed.

November 10, 1997, to Bob Harvey and Patricia Burke
A denial need not cite specific statute.

December 4, 2012, to North Dakota State University
Incident reports filed with Risk Management of OMB are exempt records under N.D.C.C. § 32-12.2-11. Handwritten notes filed with and attached to the report that describe the specific incident are also exempt. Under this statute, the public entity submitting the report does not have discretion to disclose the exempt record without the authorization of Risk Management.
N.D.A.G. 2009-O-08  June 15, 2009, to University of North Dakota Alumni Association and University of North Dakota Foundation
Requested record did not contain exempt donor information.

N.D.A.G. 2008-L-20  December 22, 2008, to Agriculture Commissioner
Confidential records cannot be released for “medical necessity” under Pesticide Act.

N.D.A.G. 2008-O-27  December 1, 2008, to University of North Dakota
UND failed to consider whether the records of any or all of the students could be released after removing personally identifiable information.

N.D.A.G. 2008-O-20  August 1, 2008, to Workforce Safety and Insurance
N.D.C.C. § 65-04-15 only protects safety grant records that would reveal premium or payroll information.

Personnel records of a non-profit entity may be exempt.

N.D.A.G. 2006-O-03  February 14, 2006, to Red River Valley Fair Association
Personnel records of public entity.

Personnel records of public entity.

N.D.A.G. 2004-O-23  October 27, 2004, to Stark County
Information in evidence log.

Comprehensive booklist of required textbooks is trade secret.

Unemployment compensation records kept by job service.

N.D.A.G. 2004-L-09  January 30, 2004, to Carol Olson
Social Security Numbers are confidential under N.D.C.C. § 44-04-28 and may only be released as provided by this section or by other state or federal law. N.D.C.C. § 50-06-15 constitutes “other law” that allows the Department of Human Services to disclose social security numbers for administration of DHS programs.

N.D.A.G. 2003-L-38  September 15, 2003, to David Glatt
Names and addresses of landowners participating in state ground water monitoring are confidential under N.D.C.C. § 23-33-08.

Names of companies having agreements with North Dakota under the Streamlined Sales Tax Project confidential.

N.D.A.G. 2002-L-55  October 4, 2002, to Aaron Kauter
Retirement benefits records in personnel file.

Wills deposited with county recorder.

Out-of-wedlock births and causes of death released for statistical purposes.

Inmate records.

N.D.A.G. 99-L-115  November 18, 1999, to Howard Swanson
Rights of member of governing body to closed or confidential records.
N.D.A.G. 98-F-28  November 23, 1998, to Carol Olson Conflicts with statutes restricting further disclosure.
N.D.A.G. 61-116  December 28, 1961 Governor cannot compel insurance commissioner to divulge confidential communications.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT RECORDS

SEE TRADE SECRETS

EXECUTIVE SESSION, RECORDINGS AND MINUTES

N.D.A.G. 2019-O-19  October 17, 2019, to North Dakota Board of Chiropractic Examiners It is proper to deny a records request for an executive session recording that was not authorized to be released by the governing body.
N.D.A.G. 99-O-07  June 29, 1999, to Ed Malazdrewicz Recording is not an open record.
FEES FOR ACCESS AND COPIES

N.D.A.G. 2018-O-03
February 9, 2018, to City of Bismarck
Before undertaking the monumental task of reviewing and redacting a large number of records, a public entity may provide an estimate of costs based on legally chargeable fees and ask for payment upfront before it begins working on the request.

N.D.A.G. 2018-O-02
February 9, 2018, to Mandan Progress Organization
A public entity is allowed to estimate charges associated with responding to a records request as long as such charges are in compliance with N.D.C.C. § 44-04-18.

N.D.A.G. 2018-O-01
January 30, 2018, to Morton County Sheriff’s Department
A statute that authorizes a public entity to charge a specific amount for records will trump the general charging laws of N.D.C.C. § 44-04-18.

N.D.A.G. 2016-O-20
September 23, 2016, to City of Cooperstown
Charges were reasonable when auditor began fulfilling request that was later changed by the requestor.

N.D.A.G. 2014-O-18
November 5, 2014, to City of Minot
The open records law does not allow entities to charge for the time it spends gathering, copying, organizing, forwarding, scanning, and printing records, time spent saving responsive records to a zip drive, or time spent corresponding with others regarding record requests. An entity can only charge $.25 per page for printing electronic records if it is necessary for redaction of closed and confidential information.

N.D.A.G. 2014-O-17
November 5, 2014, to City of Mandan
The open records law allowing for one free hour “per request” does not necessarily mean “per contact.” It is reasonable for a public entity to consider subject matter and timing when determining the location charge.

N.D.A.G. 2012-O-08
August 2, 2012, to North Dakota State University Research & Technology Park

N.D.A.G. 2011-O-12
August 30, 2011, to North Dakota State University
While a public entity may charge up to 25 cents a page for a paper copy, there is no charge for a copy provided electronically unless use of information technology resources is necessary. Law allows an hourly fee charge to excise confidential or closed information from e-mails if excising takes longer than one hour.

N.D.A.G. 2008-O-18
July 15, 2008, to Mountrail County
Generally the wages attributable to the time public employees devote to maintaining and update public records has never been an allowable cost in determining the charges for a copy of a public record.

N.D.A.G. 2008-O-17
July 15, 2008, to Adams County
A public entity may charge a reasonable fee for providing the copies, including costs attributable to the use of information technology resources.
The first hour spent reviewing records for confidential or exempt information is free.

All the charges associated with making copies of 213 records were authorized by statute.

N.D.C.C. § 11-18-05(3) provides fees for recorded instruments in any format in possession of the county recorder.

Fee for providing access to electronically stored information from an outside location.

After the first hour, a public entity may charge a fee for locating requested records.

A public entity may charge fees for locating records and excising confidential information, and the actual cost of copies.

Estimate of costs not based on legally allowable charges.

Fee used to deter requestor.

Fee charged not actual cost.

Locating charge of $25 per hour cannot be charged for time formatting data.

Public entity may charge $25 per hour after the first hour for locating e-mails.

Excess fees.

Determining actual cost of copies, including labor.

Search fee.

Fee for creating new records.

Increased fees for sheriff records.

Excess fees.
N.D.A.G. 98-O-03  February 20, 1998, to Glenn Giese and Lester Brackel
   No charge for locating records.

N.D.A.G. 96-L-232  December 3, 1996, to J. Thomas Traynor
   Fee for local copy of accident report (superseding N.D.A.G. 96-L-119

N.D.A.G. 94-F-25  August 5, 1994, to Rodney Feldner
   Reasonable fee means actual cost to the agency of making the copies.

   No access charge for computer records.

   Charge for copies but not for access.

N.D.A.G. 89-07  June 23, 1989, to Nancy Jo Bateman
   Access fees are not permitted.

N.D.A.G. Letter  November 2, 1987, to Richard Olson
   Reasonable charge for copies of records.

N.D.A.G. Letter  December 19, 1983, to Duane Liffrig
   Agency can only recover its cost of providing public records.

N.D.A.G. 82-02  January 20, 1982, to Herbert Engberg
   Fee for access to records outside regular office hours.

FINANCIAL INFORMATION

SEE TRADE SECRETS

HIGHER EDUCATION

N.D.A.G. 2008-O-27  December 1, 2008, to University of North Dakota
   Under FERPA, disciplinary records may be released if personally
   identifiable information is adequately removed.

N.D.A.G. 2005-O-05  March 30, 2005, to NDSU
   Request for records of professor in electronic format.

   Records of privately operated bookstore at UND.

   Privately funded university research projects.

N.D.A.G. 85-03  January 22, 1985, to John Richardson
   Private investigator's report on a faculty member.

HUMAN SERVICES

See also: ABUSE AND NEGLECT

N.D.A.G. 2003-O-21  December 1, 2003, to Department of Human Services
   Written request for records not prerequisite to getting the record.
N.D.A.G. 99-L-57    July 6, 1999, to Carol Olson
Department is not an "occupational or professional board".

FBI criminal history information.

Early child services.

Investigation by mental health professional under N.D.C.C.
§ 25-03.1-08.

N.D.A.G. 72-322     February 9, 1972, to Walter Fiedler
Records of Grafton State School.

N.D.A.G. 64-239     December 30, 1964, to John Alphson
Request from IRS for welfare recipient information.

N.D.A.G. 56-95      April 4, 1956
Inspection by elected public officials.

INMATE RECORDS

Inmate medical records.

Disclosure of confidential DOCR records.

N.D.A.G. 2000-F-09  February 28, 2000, to Frank Wald
Juvenile and federal inmates.

N.D.A.G. 2000-L-18  February 14, 2000, to Elaine Little
DOCR records are generally confidential (see also N.D.A.G. 2000-L-48
April 4, 2000, to Warren Emmer).

N.D.A.G. Letter     April 3, 1992, to Orell Schmitz
Protection and Advocacy Project's access to inmate records.

N.D.A.G. Letter     February 12, 1986, to James Marion
Notice of application for parole is confidential.

JUVENILE RECORDS

SEE LAW ENFORCEMENT

LAW ENFORCEMENT

N.D.A.G. 2019-O-01  April 4, 2019, to North Dakota Forensic Examiner's Office and the
University of North Dakota School of Medicine and Health Science
It was appropriate for the public entities to contact the law enforcement
investigating agency to determine whether information contained in an
otherwise public record could be withheld as active criminal intelligence
and investigative information.
August 23, 2017, to Morton County State’s Attorney’s Office and Morton County Sheriff’s Department

Although body camera images taken by law enforcement in a public place are not protected under N.D.C.C. § 44-04-18.7, they may be withheld pursuant to other applicable law such as active criminal intelligence and investigation records under N.D.C.C. § 44-04-18.7.

October 6, 2014, to West Fargo Police Department

A police department’s decision to withhold the identity of a victim as exempt “active criminal investigative information” was proper based on the circumstances at the time of the records request.

September 30, 2014, to Grand Forks Police Department

Transcripts of 9-1-1 calls are generally open under N.D.C.C. § 57-40.6-07(4), however, if the transcripts contain information made exempt or confidential by other laws, such information may be withheld or redacted pursuant to open records law.

June 12, 2013, to Turtle Lake-Mercer School Board

“Background checks,” consist of searching publicly available information and are not confidential. Distinguished from a “criminal history record check” which are confidential and are performed by the Bureau of Criminal Investigation and consist of searching confidential law enforcement databases.

May 4, 2006, to North Dakota Stockmen’s Association

A law enforcement authority can withhold active criminal investigative information.

August 10, 2005, to Grand Forks Police Department

Case is active if prosecution is not complete.

January 20, 2004, to Jamestown Police Department

File not active when there was no ongoing investigation.

April 1, 2002, to Kenneth Dalstad

Minors who can be considered juveniles.

June 13, 2000, to Howard Swanson

Distinction between a compilation of a person’s criminal history and source documents.

February 28, 2000, to Frank Wald

“Law enforcement” does not include correctional facilities.

January 18, 2000, to Timothy Priebe

Juvenile records must pertain to a child who was alleged or found to be delinquent, unruly, or deprived.

December 9, 1999, to James Odegard

Sharing of confidential information within a state’s attorney’s office.

August 6, 1999, to Wayne Stenehjem

Clerks and criminal history records.

April 9, 1998, to Kenneth Dalsted

Information obtained under a warrant.

March 30, 1998, to Carol Olson

FBI criminal history information.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N.D.A.G. 95-L-181</td>
<td>July 31, 1995, to Larry Quast</td>
<td>School access to juvenile records.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.D.A.G. 94-L-311</td>
<td>November 10, 1994, to Doug Mattson</td>
<td>Charge for requests by social service board for criminal history record information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.D.A.G. Letter</td>
<td>September 9, 1992, to Lonnie Olson</td>
<td>Videotape of adult arrested for DUI is a record.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.D.A.G. 88-04</td>
<td>February 8, 1988, to Alan Duppler</td>
<td>Abuse and neglect investigation reports.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MEDICAL RECORDS**

|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|
N.D.A.G. 93-L-104  March 22, 1993, to Lyle Gallagher
Records on HIV status.

N.D.A.G. 84-05  January 19, 1984, to James Twomey
Access to privileged medical information regarding abuse and neglect.

N.D.A.G. 62-152  February 23, 1962,
Access to results of blood test by the subject of the test.

N.D.A.G. 45-241  May 8, 1945
Ownership of medical records.

N.D.A.G. 45-240  February 10, 1945
Disclosure of fugitive's medical information to Department of Justice.

MINUTES

N.D.A.G. 2017-O-06  August 23, 2017, to Foster County Water Resource Board
No reason to delay response in order to bring the request for meeting minutes before the board at its next meeting.

N.D.A.G. 2016-O-17  August 11, 2016, to Lidgerwood Rural District Ambulance Service
Draft meeting minutes cannot be withheld from an open records request until approved by a governing body.

At time of record request, draft minutes had not been prepared. It was not an unreasonably delay with the minutes were provided the day after the minutes were completed.

Minutes not prepared at time of request.

Review of draft minutes.

Whether minutes were requested is question of fact.

N.D.A.G. 98-O-11  June 8, 1998, to Duane Mullenberg & Fabian Noack
Draft minutes.

Meeting notes and draft minutes.

N.D.A.G. 92-08  April 8, 1992, to Mary Nordsven
The governing body of a modern council city was not required to publish minutes of meetings in an official newspaper.

NONGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS
See also: PUBLIC ENTITY

When a government entity delegates a public duty to a third party, documents in possession of the third party connected with public business are public records within the meaning of N.D.C.C. § 44-04-18.
N.D.A.G. 2014-O-07  
July 28, 2014, to North Dakota State University Development Foundation  
Foundations affiliated with public universities whose sole purpose is to support universities are "public entities" and records related to foundation expenditures for resources is considered "public business" subject to open records law.

N.D.A.G. 2009-O-08  
June 15, 2009, to University of North Dakota Alumni Association and University of North Dakota Foundation.  
Entities are agents of UND when performing governmental functions set forth in agreement.

N.D.A.G. 2008-O-26  
November 12, 2008, to CommunityWorks North Dakota, North Dakota Housing Finance Agency  
CommunityWorks is not subject to the open records law. The North Dakota Finance Agency is subject to the open records law

N.D.A.G. 2006-O-04  
February 21, 2006, to Bismarck-Mandan Orchestral Association  
A nonprofit supported by or expending public funds is a public entity.

N.D.A.G. 2004-L-25  
April 1, 2004, to Sen. Ray Holmberg  
Barnes & Noble acting as agent of UND in operating bookstore.

N.D.A.G. 2003-O-10  
September 4, 2003, to Tri-County Intervention, Inc.  
Nonprofit receives money for its general support.

N.D.A.G. 2003-O-08  
July 22, 2003, to Dakota Center for Independent Living  
Nonprofit recognized by state law and performing public function.

N.D.A.G. 2003-O-02  
February 21, 2003, to James River Senior Citizen’s Center  
Senior citizen’s center receiving unrestricted funds used for general support is a public entity.

N.D.A.G. 2003-O-01  
January 30, 2003, to Minot School Board  
Contractor making energy conservation improvements is not a public entity or agent of school district.

N.D.A.G. 2002-O-09  
September 17, 2002, to Van de Streek, Boughey, and Lee  
Minot Area Chamber of Commerce Task Force is supported by public funds and an agent of the city of Minot.

N.D.A.G. 2001-O-11  
September 13, 2001, to Greg Selbo  
Economic development corporation.

N.D.A.G. 2001-O-10  
September 7, 2001, to Lamont & Van de Streek  
Economic development corporation; exception to fair market value of economic development assistance.

N.D.A.G. 2001-O-04  
May 16, 2001, to Laural Forsberg  
Advertising firm under contract with public entity.

N.D.A.G. 99-O-03  
April 7, 1999, to Murray Sagsveen  
Unrestricted funds for general support.

N.D.A.G. 99-O-02  
April 5, 1999, to Steve Spilde  
Government self-insurance pool.

N.D.A.G. 98-O-24  
November 23, 1998, to Garylle Stewart and Vern Bennett  
Unrestricted funds for general support.

N.D.A.G. 98-F-19  
June 10, 1998, to Carol Olson  
Payments under a "grant" agreement.
OPEN RECORDS, IN GENERAL

2021-O-11  November 8, 2021 to City of Oberon
A delay of over three months to provide responsive records, and failing to provide records at all before the opinion was issued, violates open records laws.

N.D.A.G. 2020-O-02  April 29, 2020, to Bismarck Public School District #1 and Bismarck Public School Board
If a request is specifically made for handwritten notes, a public entity must provide the notes, even if not easily legible or readable.

N.D.A.G. 2018-O-23  December 10, 2018, to Dakota Center for Independent Living
Response to vague open records request was reasonable interpretation.

N.D.A.G. 2016-O-08  April 25, 2016, to City of Golva
A public entity cannot circumvent the open records law by suddenly refusing to use available means of communication previously used to receive record requests without warning or providing an alternative option.

N.D.A.G. 2015-O-16  October 19, 2015, to Stark County
If there is a request for a recording in possession of a public entity, the public entity must provide the recording to the requestor, but may pass on the charges associated with placing the recording on a device, such as a thumb drive, if such a device is needed in order to fulfill the record request. The public entity cannot require the requestor to furnish the medium utilized to fulfill the records request.

N.D.A.G. 2011-O-11  August 24, 2011, to North Dakota Department of Human Services
Requests from adversary to action or proceeding for privileged records; application of discovery rules.

N.D.A.G. 2010-O-04  April 20, 2010, to North Dakota State University Research & Technology Park
Providing access to records generally does not require approval, supervision, or action by a head of agency.

N.D.A.G. 2009-O-02  February 20, 2009, to City of Mandan
A public entity cannot ask the name of a person seeking records or employer name as a condition of receiving records.

N.D.A.G. 2008-O-29  December 12, 2008, to North Dakota High School Activities Association
An entity must provide an e-mail copy of a record if asked, even if the record is available on the entity’s website.

N.D.A.G. 2008-O-19  July 15, 2008, to Foster County
Out of state businesses have the same right of access to records even if the business intends to use the records for profit.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Date</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Citation</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 2, 2008</td>
<td>Pierce County Social Services</td>
<td>N.D.A.G. 2008-O-08</td>
<td>A public entity may not require requests for records to be in writing under the pretext of clarification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 24, 2007</td>
<td>Coolin Township</td>
<td>N.D.A.G. 2007-O-07</td>
<td>Records in the possession of a private attorney employed by a public entity that related to those duties are subject to the open records law.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 17, 2007</td>
<td>Burleigh County Commission</td>
<td>N.D.A.G. 2007-O-06</td>
<td>An individual requesting public records is not required to take further action after the initial request.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 12, 2007</td>
<td>North Dakota Department of Transportation</td>
<td>N.D.A.G. 2007-O-01</td>
<td>Information contained in a database is an open record.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 18, 2006</td>
<td>Bismarck Parks and Recreation District</td>
<td>N.D.A.G. 2006-O-15</td>
<td>A public entity cannot imply that a form must be completed in order to request records.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 21, 2006</td>
<td>Bismarck-Mandan Orchestral Association</td>
<td>N.D.A.G. 2006-O-04</td>
<td>If an entity’s public funds are commingled with other funds, all records are open.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 6, 2005</td>
<td>Mayor of City of Oakes</td>
<td>N.D.A.G. 2005-O-16</td>
<td>Irrelevant that records were only “suggestions”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 27, 2005</td>
<td>Twin Buttes Public School</td>
<td>N.D.A.G. 2005-O-09</td>
<td>Cannot require request for records to be in writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 11, 2005</td>
<td>Napoleon Economic Dev. Corp.</td>
<td>N.D.A.G. 2005-O-06</td>
<td>May not withhold records that are preliminary or tentative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 7, 2004</td>
<td>City of Napoleon</td>
<td>N.D.A.G. 2004-O-20</td>
<td>Duty to provide records within reasonable time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 17, 2004</td>
<td>Grand Forks County Planning &amp; Zoning Department</td>
<td>N.D.A.G. 2004-O-05</td>
<td>Several factors determine whether response was within reasonable time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1, 2003</td>
<td>Department of Human Services</td>
<td>N.D.A.G. 2003-O-21</td>
<td>Written clarification of request is not a prerequisite to receiving records.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 12, 2003</td>
<td>Northwood Park Board</td>
<td>N.D.A.G. 2003-O-19</td>
<td>Request for records at a meeting is a valid request.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 22, 2003</td>
<td>Dakota Center for Independent Living</td>
<td>N.D.A.G. 2003-O-08</td>
<td>Request is overbroad if entity cannot reasonably identify the records.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 30, 2003</td>
<td>Minot Public School Board</td>
<td>N.D.A.G. 2003-O-01</td>
<td>Document not in the public entity’s possession is not a “record”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 5, 2002</td>
<td>Mark Bachmeier</td>
<td>N.D.A.G. 2002-L-32</td>
<td>Effect of legislative changes making records open that were previously exempt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
N.D.A.G. 2002-O-05  April 1, 2002, to Fred Strege
Requests from adversary to action or proceeding for privileged records; application of discovery rules.

Distinction between affirmative disclosure and release upon request.

N.D.A.G. 2001-F-10  December 11, 2001, to Eric Hardmeyer
Bank of North Dakota customer information.

N.D.A.G. 2001-O-12  September 26, 2001, to Randall Sickler
Broad requests for records; effective date of new exceptions.

N.D.A.G. 2001-O-06  June 18, 2001, to Norbert Sickler
Definition of “copy”.

N.D.A.G. 2000-F-09  February 28, 2000, to Frank Wald
Most open records exceptions are specific to each public entity; public entity cannot create open records exception by contract.

N.D.A.G. 99-O-02  April 5, 1999, to Steve Spilde
Settlement agreements.

Multiple copies not required; no duty to create record.

Records possessed by two entities.

N.D.A.G. 98-F-13  May 12, 1998, to Johanna Zschomler
Requests by litigants.

N.D.A.G. 98-O-07  April 24, 1998, to Norbert Sickler
Discarding records subject to a pending request.

N.D.A.G. 98-O-03  February 20, 1998, to Glenn Giese and Lester Brackel
Requests by telephone.

N.D.A.G. 94-L-194  August 1, 1994, to Shirley Dykshoorn
Three categories of records: open, exempt, and confidential.

N.D.A.G. Letter  May 18, 1992, to Wayne Solberg
Records in possession of third party contractor.

Appropriate response to request for copies of open records.

N.D.A.G. Letter  July 17, 1991, to Steven Tomac
Hours of access to open records and permitted security measures.

N.D.A.G. Letter  November 2, 1987, to Richard Olson
Copies of open records.

Rules of evidence and procedure do not apply to records requests.

N.D.A.G. 82-23  March 25, 1982, to Kent Conrad
Time within which to respond to an open records request.

N.D.A.G. 82-02  January 20, 1982, to Herbert Engberg
Hours of access.

N.D.A.G. 79-106  August 8, 1979, to William Gorder
Meaning of “reasonable office hours”.

23
How to respond to request for open records.

N.D.A.G. Letter November 23, 1976, to Arthur Link
Agreement by state agency to keep federal information confidential.

N.D.A.G. 45-26 August 13, 1945
Changing public records.

PERSONAL INFORMATION
See also PUBLIC EMPLOYEES

N.D.A.G. 2015-O-16 October 19, 2015, to Stark County
Generally, applications and interview scores are considered public records that must be provided if requested. Some information may be redacted if provided by law, such as “personal information” under N.D.C.C. 44-04-18.1.

N.D.A.G. 99-L-57 July 6, 1999, to Carol Olson
Department is not an "occupational or professional board".

Resumes and job applications.

N.D.A.G. 97-L-13 January 29, 1997, to Gerald Sveen
Notice of procedure to withhold personal driver information.

POSSESSION OF RECORDS

N.D.A.G. 2019-O-13 July 18, 2019, to Dickinson School District
The School District properly denied a request for records it did not have in its possession.

N.D.A.G. 2017-O-01 March 10, 2017, to University of North Dakota
Preliminary designs of a logo in the possession of a UND’s agent were subject to open records law which cannot be limited by policy or contract.

It is not a violation of open records law to fail to immediately produce records that are inaccessible for a certain amount of time until such records become available.

N.D.A.G. 2013-O-18 November 22, 2013, to North Dakota University Systems
Once an open records request is made, the public entity has the duty to preserve the records it has in its possession at that time.

N.D.A.G. 2012-O-09 December 4, 2012, to North Dakota State University
Usually, when a public entity is in possession of a record that is exempt, the entity possessing the records has discretion to disclose the records. However, N.D.C.C. § 32-12.2-11 requires the consent of Risk Management in order to disclose the exempt record.

N.D.A.G. 2010-O-02 February 26, 2010, to Pembina County Emergency Management Office
Each agency of a political subdivision is responsible only for records in its possession and not for records that are in the possession of another agency, even if they are part of the same political subdivision.
PRELIMINARY DRAFTS AND WORKING PAPERS

N.D.A.G. 2015-O-08  April 28, 2015, to Oberon Public School and School Board
Disclosure of draft minutes may not be conditioned on the approval of the minutes by the governing body.

N.D.A.G. 2015-O-07  April 20, 2015, to Fargo-Moorhead Diversion Authority Agricultural Policy Committee
A preliminary study became an open record when it was presented to the governing body of the subcommittee at an open meeting and related to the public business delegated to the subcommittee.

N.D.A.G. 2009-O-01  February 2, 2009, to North Dakota State University
A University could use either 44-04-18(9) or (10) depending on the circumstances in order to deny a preliminary draft or working paper.

Source documents that are complete in themselves are not “working papers”.

“Right of first review” and “work in progress”.

N.D.A.G. 2001-O-02  April 5, 2001, to Gary Thune
Applications submitted to personnel firm are source documents and not protected.

Definition of “working papers” and “preliminary drafts”
February 20, 1998, to Glenn Giese and Lester Brackel
Completed forms are not "working papers".

**PROPRIETARY INFORMATION**

**SEE TRADE SECRETS**

**PUBLIC BUSINESS**

The Urban Plains Center relates to the governmental function of the school and park district and is thus a matter of public business.

N.D.A.G. 2007-O-07  April 24, 2007, to Coolin Township
Recorded information of any kind received or prepared for use in connection with public business is a public record.

N.D.A.G. 2005-O-16  October 6, 2005, to Mayor of City of Oakes
Record given to council at meeting by mayor with suggestions is public business.

N.D.A.G. 2001-O-11  September 13, 2001, to Greg Selbo
Financial records of supported organization, audit reports, and personnel matters.

Public business of supported organization includes all financial records.

N.D.A.G. 98-L-128  September 2, 1998, to Jeff Rotering
"Record" requires link or association to the entity’s public business.

N.D.A.G. 94-F-19  July 1, 1994, to Jerome Kelsh
Records of Labor Commissioner's telephone use and travel claims are open.

University research projects for private firm.

**PUBLIC EMPLOYEES**

N.D.A.G. 2019-O-06  April 16, 2019, to North Dakota Highway Patrol, Cass County Sheriff’s Office, Bismarck Police Department, and Mandan Police Department
Making an open record request to an employee of a public entity is equivalent to making a request to the public entity itself.

N.D.A.G. 2013-O-16  November 8, 2013, to Jamestown/Stutsman County Development Corporation
Although personnel records of public employees are generally open, there is an exception for employees for public entities that are subject to open records law only because they are supported by public funds. JSDC is supported by public funds and is an agent performing a governmental function so it cannot claim this exception for personnel records.
N.D.A.G. 2002-L-55 October 4, 2002, to Aaron Kauter
Confidentiality of insurance plan participation and employer contribution to employee’s insurance premiums.

Resumes and job applications.

N.D.A.G. 97-F-06 September 10, 1997, to Sparb Collins
Confidentiality of employee benefit records.

N.D.A.G. 94-L-309 November 9, 1994, to Sparb Collins
Disclosure of confidential information by telephone to the employee.

N.D.A.G. Letter May 18, 1992, to Wayne Solberg
Confidentiality of records possessed by a third party contractor.

N.D.A.G. Letter April 21, 1988, to R.L. Rayl
Privacy of personnel file.

N.D.A.G. Letter January 11, 1988, to Alan Person
Ownership of PERS records in possession of group health insurance provider.

N.D.A.G. Letter March 17, 1987, to Alan Person
Medical records of claims administrator are the property of PERS.

N.D.A.G. 85-03 January 22, 1985, to John Richardson
Private investigator’s report on a faculty member.

N.D.A.G. 81-05 February 3, 1981, to F.C. Rohrich
Application for city police officer.

PUBLIC ENTITY

N.D.A.G. 2017-O-07 August 25, 2017, to University of North Dakota School of Law – Moot Court Association
Whether a student organization at a public university is subject to open records law requires the same analysis as any other organization.

N.D.A.G. 2015-O-05 April 6, 2014, to North Dakota Council of Educational Leaders
The NDCEL was not considered a “public entity” subject to open records law because all public funds it received were exchanged for fair market value of the goods and services provided.

N.D.A.G. 2014-O-04 April 24, 2014, to Dickinson State University Foundation
State universities are “public entities” and the solicitation and receipt of donations for the university, promoting and aiding the university, fundraising for the university, and keeping records of such activities are vital and indispensable government functions. Affiliated foundations that undertake these activities on behalf of universities perform government functions and are therefore “public entities” subject to the same open records law.

A “public entity” includes entities that are created or recognized by state statute, or by an action of a political subdivision, to exercise public authority or perform a governmental function.
N.D.A.G. 2013-O-10 June 25, 2013, to North Dakota University System Foundation
Foundation is supported by and expends public funds on behalf of NDUS. Foundation records relate to the public business of NDUS. Foundation is therefore a public entity.

N.D.A.G. 2011-O-10 August 10, 2011, to Cass County Historical Society
Cass County Historical Society is a public entity because it is supported by and expends public funds, it is recognized by state law as a county historical society, and it promotes historical work including historical preservation, which is a governmental function.

N.D.A.G. 2011-O-09 June 29, 2011, to Bank of North Dakota
Industrial Commission is a governing body of the Bank of North Dakota and a public entity subject to open records law.

N.D.A.G. 2010-O-02 February 26, 2010, to Pembina County Emergency Management Office
County emergency services office is public entity.

N.D.A.G. 2006-O-08 May 4, 2006, to North Dakota Stockmen’s Association
An entity that acts as an agent of the state, performs a governmental function and receives an appropriation is a public entity.

N.D.A.G. 2006-O-03 February 14, 2006, to Red River Valley Fair Association
Fair Association.

N.D.A.G. 2006-O-01 January 9, 2006, to NDSU Research Foundation
NDSU Research Foundation is subject to open records law because it acts as an “agent” of NDSU.

Barnes & Noble public entity operating bookstore as agent of UND.

Nonprofit receives money for its general support from state funds.

N.D.A.G. 2003-O-08 July 22, 2003, to Dakota Center for Independent Living
Nonprofit recognized by state law to perform governmental function.

N.D.A.G. 2003-O-02 February 21, 2003, to James River Senior Citizen’s Center
Senior citizen’s center is a public entity.

Contractor making energy conservation improvements is not a public entity.

N.D.A.G. 2002-O-09 September 17, 2002, to Van de Streek, Boughey, and Lee
Minot Area Chamber of Commerce Task Force is a public entity.

Teachers’ representative organization.

N.D.A.G. 2001-O-11 September 13, 2001, to Greg Selbo
Economic development corporation is agent of public entity – nine factors.

N.D.A.G. 2001-O-10 September 7, 2001, to Lamont and Van de Streek
Economic development corporation is agent of public entity.

Advertising firm under contract.

N.D.A.G. 99-O-02 April 5, 1999, to Steve Spilde
Government self-insurance pool.
Joint enterprise of several counties.

N.D.A.G. Letter  August 2, 1991, to Ken Solberg
Government self-insurance pool.

Entities created by governmental process are public entities.

State planning division is a public entity.

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

The PSC is subject to N.D.C.C. § 44-04-18.

REASONABLE FEE

SEE FEES FOR ACCESS AND COPIES

RECORD, DEFINED

Definition of “record” includes text messages in possession of
employees of public entities related to public business.

N.D.A.G. 2009-O-08  June 15, 2009, to University of North Dakota Alumni Association and
University of North Dakota Foundation
Public records in the possession of an agent of a public entity must be
disclosed unless they are exempt or confidential.

E-mails that relate to public business kept on private computers are
subject to the open records law.

N.D.A.G. 2007-O-07  April 24, 2007, to Coolin Township
A record does not include unrecorded thought processes or mental
impressions.

N.D.A.G. 2004-O-23  October 27, 2004, to Stark County
Marriage records in county recorder’s office.

E-mails contained on a computer’s electronic backup system are
records in the possession of a public entity.

N.D.A.G. 2002-L-41  July 12, 2002, to John Warcup
City’s real property appraisal.

N.D.A.G. 98-L-128  September 2, 1998, to Jeff Rotering
Link or association between record and entity’s public business.

Ownership not required.
Resumes and job applications.

N.D.A.G. 97-F-06  September 10, 1997, to Sparb Collins
"Record" means each item of recorded information.

N.D.A.G. 94-L-103  April 14, 1994, to Wayne Hokenson
City checkbook is an open record (but see N.D.A.G. 2000-L-107
June 28, 2000, to Lisa Gibbens).

N.D.A.G. 94-L-90  April 4, 1994, to Jim Yockim
Settlement agreement with county official.

N.D.A.G. Letter  September 9, 1992, to Lonnie Olson
Videotape of person arrested for DUI is a record.

Open records law applies to computer records.

N.D.A.G. Letter  March 19, 1990, to Janet Wentz
Open records law does not apply to unwritten mental or thought
processes.

N.D.A.G. Letter  April 21, 1988, to R.L. Rayl
A copy of pre-termination letter to an employee is a record.

N.D.A.G. Letter  March 14, 1985, to Rick Bock
Definition of "record" under N.D.C.C. ch. 54-46 does not apply to the
open records law.

N.D.A.G. 85-03  January 22, 1985, to John Richardson
"Record" includes private investigator's report on a faculty member.

"Record" does not include every scrap of material in possession of a
public official.

"Record" includes official documents, reports, and day-to-day
 correspondence.

RECORD RETENTION

Once an e-mail is deleted from a computer's electronic backup
system, it is no longer in the possession of the public entity.

N.D.A.G. 95-L-94  April 17, 1995, to Lt. Governor Rosemarie Myrdal
Record retention policy review for North Dakota Protection and
Advocacy Project.

N.D.A.G. 74-348  December 4, 1974, to Ben Meier
Microfilming of state records.

N.D.A.G. 73-352  June 21, 1973, to Ben Meier
Transferring or loaning of records to a university.

N.D.A.G. 72-343  December 1, 1972, to William Guy
Disposal of records of Governor's office.
Final decision on retention rests with Secretary of State as State Records Administrator.

SCHOOLS

N.D.A.G. 2013-O-08 May 24, 2013, to North Dakota State University
Student discipline records are confidential under FERPA and can only be released if personally identifiable information can be properly redacted. FERPA does not allow disclosure of redacted records if the record could still be traced to individual students upon release. The educational institute must analyze whether records can be redacted to such an extent that the release would not violate FERPA.

N.D.A.G. 2005-O-09 May 27, 2005, to Twin Buttes Public School
Request for records not required to be in writing.

Request for preliminary budget that did not exist.

Must make diligent search for records and disclose all relevant to request.

Contractor making energy conservation improvements is not a public entity of the school district.

N.D.A.G. 2002-O-05 April 1, 2002, to Fred Strege
Administrative investigation files.

N.D.A.G. 2002-L-19 April 1, 2002, to Kenneth Dalstad
Release of education records regarding tobacco use by minor.

N.D.A.G. 2000-O-06 May 5, 2000, to Tom Irgens
Letter based on bus driver's personal observations as a parent is not a FERPA record.

N.D.A.G. 2000-O-04 March 15, 2000, to Larry Gegelman
Non-academic records in student's permanent file.

N.D.A.G. 98-L-51 April 24, 1998, to Gary Gronberg
Teacher journals.

N.D.A.G. 95-L-181 July 31, 1995, to Larry Quast
School access to juvenile records.

N.D.A.G. 94-L-278 October 17, 1994, to Jeff Rotering
Assistance by school officials.

Disclosure of communications made during school counseling session.

Posting of deficiency list under FERPA.

N.D.A.G. Letter January 26, 1990, to Gary Knell
Student survey results.

N.D.A.G. Letter June 6, 1986, to Wayne Sanstead
Library records.
N.D.A.G. Letter  
June 5, 1986, to Emil Riehl  
Log book of absentee ballots.

N.D.A.G. 84-37  
November 14, 1984, to Lee Christofferson  
Interview of child at school regarding report of abuse or neglect.

N.D.A.G. 81-130  
December 7, 1981, to Jan Dykshoorn  
Student directory information.

**SECRETARY OF STATE**

N.D.A.G. Letter  
December 18, 1992, to Rosellen Sand  
Financial information in reports filed with Secretary of State.

N.D.A.G. 74-606  
April 8, 1974, to Ben Meier  
Disposition of UCC financing statements.

N.D.A.G. 72-340  
October 11, 1972, to Martin Gronvold  
Records of conveyance of property by the State.

N.D.A.G. 62-46  
May 4, 1962  
Annual corporate reports.

N.D.A.G. 57-148  
August 22, 1957  
Search fees.

N.D.A.G. 56-139  
August 13, 1956  
Review of document by Secretary of State.

**TAX RECORDS**

N.D.A.G. 2003-O-11  
September 4, 2003, to State Tax Commissioner  
Names of companies contracted with North Dakota under Streamlined Sales Tax Project confidential.

N.D.A.G. 2001-L-36  
September 14, 2015, to Robert Peterson  
Review of income tax confidentiality under N.D.C.C. § 57-38-57.

N.D.A.G. 71-408  
November 22, 1971, to Byron Dorgan  
Privacy of income tax returns.

N.D.A.G. 68-301  
February 6, 1968, to Edwin Sjaastad  
Preservation of tax records.

N.D.A.G. 66-370  
May 25, 1966, to Edwin Sjaastad  
Privacy of tax returns.

N.D.A.G. 64-404  
July 31, 1964, to Lloyd Omdahl  
Disclosure of a list of taxpayers.

N.D.A.G. 58-149  
March 21, 1958  
Disclosure of whether a person has filed a return.

**TOXICOLOGIST**

N.D.A.G. 73-488  
November 28, 1973, to N.G.S. Rao  
Disclosure of deceased person's blood alcohol tests.
TRADE SECRETS
including economic development records, proprietary, commercial, and financial information

N.D.A.G. 2017-O-01  March 10, 2017, to University of North Dakota
Agent presented articulated reasoning and facts to support the conclusion that preliminary designs, if released, would cause substantial competitive injury to the agent and were therefore considered proprietary and trade secret information.

N.D.A.G. 2016-O-03  January 25, 2016, to North Dakota State University Alumni Association and Development Foundation
The entity claiming records are confidential “trade secrets” must show it derives independent, economic value from the information.

North Dakota Mill and Elevator Association’s customer information, including the customer list and transaction information, was confidential “commercial information” because disclosure of the requested information would cause substantial competitive injury.

N.D.A.G. 2011-O-09  June 29, 2011, to Bank of North Dakota
Bank of North Dakota is a financial institution that is subject to statutory and federal law that requires it keep the “commercial or financial information of a customer” confidential. Industrial Commission, as governing body to BND, is bound by confidential requirements of same law with the exception of certain loan information that is specifically authorized to be released by the Industrial Commission under statute.

Exempt economic development information may be redacted.

Booklist compiled by Barnes & Noble a trade secret.

N.D.A.G. 2002-O-09  September 17, 2002, to Van de Streek, Boughey, and Lee
Trade secrets and commercial information are of a privileged nature, competitive disadvantage if disclosed.

N.D.A.G. 2002-O-08  July 19, 2002, to David Sprynczynatyk
State Department of Transportation’s contractor payroll reports - not commercial or financial information.

N.D.A.G. 2001-O-11  September 13, 2001, to Greg Selbo
Summary of exceptions for economic development corporation.

Personal financial information.

N.D.A.G. 2000-O-07  June 26, 2000, to Tim Priebe
Economic development.

Customer names.

Competitive injury.
TRANSPORTATION, DEPARTMENT OF

N.D.A.G. 2013-L-01 January 23, 2013, North Dakota Department of Transportation
Motor vehicle accident records generated pursuant to statute are open records, including identifying, personal information, for the operators and owners of the vehicles involved in the accident. Only the portion of the report that provides the law enforcement officer’s opinion as to fault or responsibility of the accident is confidential.

N.D.A.G. 2007-O-03 March 1, 2007, to North Dakota Department of Transportation
The DOT may require a completed request form only for two specific types of records.

N.D.A.G. 2002-O-08 July 19, 2002, to David Sprynczynatyk
Contractor payroll reports.

N.D.A.G. 98-F-13 May 12, 1998, to Johanna Zschomler
Highway safety records.

N.D.A.G. 97-L-13 January 29, 1997, to Gerald Sveen
Notice of procedure to withhold personal driver information.

N.D.A.G. 96-L-232 December 3, 1996, to J. Thomas Traynor

N.D.A.G. 96-L-119 June 5, 1996, to J. Thomas Traynor
N.D.A.G. Letter  December 19, 1983, to Duane Liffrig
Agency may only charge its actual costs for releasing information in bulk.

Access to accident reports by Unsatisfied Judgment Fund.

N.D.A.G. 64-152  March 9, 1964
Access to highway department records.

UNREASONABLE DELAY

N.D.A.G. 2019-O-09  May 24, 2019
Generally, an entity’s response to a records request cannot be extended until the next scheduled meeting of the governing body. However, when specific laws authorize a governing body to deem certain records confidential, it is not a violation of open records law to extend the response until after the governing body meets to determine the status of the record and review a request for confidentiality.

N.D.A.G. 2019-O-02  April 11, 2019
It was an unreasonable delay when no work was done on responding to a records request for eight days.

N.D.A.G. 2018-O-23  December 10, 2018
Although at the time of the request the DCIL was understaffed, working on other issues, and attempting to respond to various other request from the requestor, a two week delay in responding that no records were available is unreasonable.

N.D.A.G. 2018-O-21  December 10, 2018
Generally, a four week time frame to compile, review, and produce 1,400 records would be reasonable but in this case, the request only asked for one record. The unintentional misinterpretation resulted in an unreasonable delay.

N.D.A.G. 2017-O-09  November 1, 2017, Office of Attorney General
Open records law looks at when the public entity receives a request, not the date a request was allegedly mailed, in determining whether records were provided in a reasonable time.

N.D.A.G. 2017-O-06  August 23, 2017, to Foster County Resource Board
Although commendable to go above and beyond providing proof that records do not exist, if this results in an unreasonable delay in providing a response to the requestor it violates open records law.

N.D.A.G. 2016-O-08  April 25, 2016, to City of Golva
Failure to check a city’s active email account resulted in an unreasonable delay of providing requested and readily available records.

When determining the reasonableness of a response to a records request, this office considers the circumstances of the particular request, including the workload of the staff, the volume of records requested, and the amount of time needed to review for confidential information.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Number</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N.D.A.G. 2013-O-17</td>
<td>November 8, 2013, to City of Golva</td>
<td>Three month delay was unreasonable. Being unfamiliar with a city employee’s obligation under open records law does not excuse the lengthy delay.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.D.A.G. 2013-O-15</td>
<td>September 5, 2013, to City of Lincoln - Lincoln Police Department</td>
<td>There are several factors that are considered when determining whether a delay in providing records was reasonable including the work load and other responsibilities of those who have access to the records and the need to consult with the entity’s attorney as to whether the records are open.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.D.A.G. 2013-O-14</td>
<td>August 28, 2013, to Griggs County Commission</td>
<td>An unreasonable delay in providing requested records may occur even if the records are not in the entity’s possession and allegedly not subject to open records law, if this reasoning is not communicated to the requestor. The time it takes to sort through multiple record requests from a requestor and the time it takes to draft minutes are factors to be considered when analyzing whether records were provided within a reasonable time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.D.A.G. 2012-O-07</td>
<td>August 2, 2012, to Dresden Township</td>
<td>In determining the reasonableness of a response, circumstances of a particular request are considered. Under most circumstances, one month delay in providing copies of requested records would be unreasonably, but in this situation and under the unique circumstances to a rural township, delay was reasonable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.D.A.G. 2011-O-07</td>
<td>May 26, 2011, to City of Dickinson’s Human Relations Commission</td>
<td>Although law does not usually require an immediate response, the delay in providing records generally will be measured in a few hours or a few days rather than several days or weeks. A significant delay in responding to a request for records has been found reasonable in circumstances where the request was for a large number of records, where closed or confidential information had to be excised, or where other responsibilities of the public entity demanded immediate attention.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.D.A.G. 2010-O-04</td>
<td>April 20, 2010, to North Dakota State University Research &amp; Technology Park</td>
<td>Public entity must provide access or copies of records within a reasonable time, which need not always be immediate, but will depend on facts of given situation. A number of circumstances, including balancing other responsibilities of the public entity that demand immediate attention, could reasonably delay providing records in response to request.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.D.A.G. 2010-O-02</td>
<td>February 26, 2010, to Pembina County Emergency Management Office</td>
<td>Even if a public entity does not have the requested records, it must explain to requestor that records do not exist or are not being provided within a “reasonable time.” Reasonableness is based on volume and complexity of request and other circumstances or responsibilities that may demand entity’s immediate attention. If crisis or workload of entity prevents it from immediately searching for records, entity should advise requester.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
June 4, 2009, to Department of Human Services
A record was not provided within a reasonable time.

February 2, 2009, to North Dakota State University
It was not an unreasonable delay to withhold a draft lease until work was completed on it.

October 31, 2015, to Cavalier Fire Department
A public entity must keep track of all open records requests, make a diligent search for records, and respond in a reasonable amount of time.

August 1, 2008, to Workforce Safety and Insurance
A delay of 160 days from the date of the request was unreasonable.

July 15, 2008, to Foster County
An estimate of one year to provide copies of 800 records is unreasonable.

June 24, 2008, to Dickinson State University
The university did not unreasonably delay providing the records when the delay that occurred was due to the requester refusing to pay the statutorily allowed charges.

June 23, 2008, to Round Prairie Township
The township did not provide copies of minutes within a reasonable time when it took four months to tell the requester that the minutes could not be provided because they had been stolen.

March 14, 2008, to Cavalier Fire Department and Cavalier Rural Fire Department
Delay of 23 days (16 working days) an unreasonable delay.

April 2, 2008, to Pierce County Social Services
When a public entity receives a request for records, it must either provide those records or explain why the records are not being provided within a reasonable time. Although commendable for a public entity to attempt to obtain records the entity does not have from another source, a long delay may still be unreasonable.

September 5, 2007, to Bismarck Park District
The Bismarck Park District delayed its response to a record request because it believed the request was a directive from a member of a joint special committee and did not fall under the open records laws. Upon a second request one month later but marked "personal", the Park Board provided records within 3 days.

August 3, 2007, to City of Mandan
It was an unreasonable delay not to explain for months that the requested record did not exist. Fear that a record may be misinterpreted is not a legitimate reason to delay providing a requested record.

June 26, 2007 to Kathryn City Council
A copy of minutes must be provided even though the minutes are also published in the newspaper.

April 17, 2007, to Burleigh County Commission
Two weeks to respond to a request for records is too long.

December 18, 2006, to Bismarck Parks and Recreation District
An entity cannot delay responding to a request for records simply because the entity head is out of the office.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N.D.A.G. 2006-O-08</td>
<td>May 4, 2006,</td>
<td>North Dakota Stockmen’s Association</td>
<td>An entity seeking legal advice about a request for records still must</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to NDSU Research</td>
<td></td>
<td>respond in a timely manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.D.A.G. 2006-O-01</td>
<td>January 9, 2006</td>
<td>NDSU Research Foundation</td>
<td>Unreasonable delay when the Foundation took six months to provide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to North Dakota</td>
<td></td>
<td>records to the Dakota Resource Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.D.A.G. 2005-O-05</td>
<td>March 30, 2005</td>
<td>NDSU</td>
<td>Unreasonable delay when entity continuously tried to limit the request.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.D.A.G. 2005-O-01</td>
<td>January 10, 2005</td>
<td>City of Napoleon</td>
<td>Unreasonable delay when city missed appointment to allow requestor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>access to records.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.D.A.G. 2004-O-20</td>
<td>September 7, 2004</td>
<td>City of Napoleon</td>
<td>Unreasonable delay when requestor had to ask four times for access to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>records.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.D.A.G. 2004-O-05</td>
<td>February 17, 2004</td>
<td>Grand Forks County Planning &amp; Zoning Department</td>
<td>Delay was not unreasonable when several factors were considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.D.A.G. 2003-O-21</td>
<td>December 1, 2003</td>
<td>Department of Human Services</td>
<td>Five days to provide records not unreasonable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.D.A.G. 2003-O-17</td>
<td>October 31, 2003</td>
<td>City of Grand Forks</td>
<td>Couple of months to respond to a request is unreasonable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.D.A.G. 2003-O-09</td>
<td>August 27, 2003</td>
<td>North Dakota Game &amp; Fish Department</td>
<td>Three months to provide records unreasonable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.D.A.G. 2002-O-08</td>
<td>July 19, 2002,</td>
<td>David Sprynczynatyk</td>
<td>Delay of 37 days was unreasonable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.D.A.G. 2002-O-06</td>
<td>June 27, 2002,</td>
<td>Fabian Noack</td>
<td>Delay of month and a half was unreasonable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.D.A.G. 2002-O-03</td>
<td>February 11, 2002</td>
<td>Fabian Noack</td>
<td>Delay of two months was unreasonable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.D.A.G. 2001-O-12</td>
<td>September 26, 2001</td>
<td>Randall Sickler</td>
<td>Delay when requester indicates he will pick up the requested records.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.D.A.G. 2001-O-04</td>
<td>May 16, 2001,</td>
<td>Laurel Forsberg</td>
<td>Delay to seek legal advice on disclosing records was unreasonable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>when requested records did not exist and legal advice was unnecessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.D.A.G. 2001-O-02</td>
<td>April 5, 2001,</td>
<td>Gary Thune</td>
<td>Delay of response until the next meeting of a governing body was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>unreasonable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Length of delay.

N.D.A.G. 98-O-20  September 15, 1998, to Every and Mitzel
Delay of month and a half was unreasonable.

Delay of more than two weeks for minutes was unreasonable.

Delay usually measured in a few days or a week.

N.D.A.G. 98-O-03  February 20, 1998, to Giese and Brackel
Factors to consider.

N.D.A.G. 97-O-01  November 10, 1997, to Harvey and Burke
Immediate access; outside office hours.

**VETERANS**

N.D.A.G. 81-08  February 5, 1981, to Lloyd Zander
Records of the Department of Veterans' Affairs.

N.D.A.G. 68-525  November 6, 1968, to Richard Thomas
Discharge and separation papers.

N.D.A.G. 50-199  October 18, 1950
Free copies of public records.

N.D.A.G. 49-196  April 30, 1949
Free copy of discharge papers.

N.D.A.G. 45-302  December 18, 1945
Recording of discharge papers.

**WORKFORCE SAFETY AND INSURANCE**

Administrative hearings.

N.D.A.G. 96-L-16  February 8, 1996, to Marv Mutzenberger
Certificate of premium payment and employer's report.

N.D.A.G. 95-L-146  June 21, 1995, to Marv Mutzenberger
List of employers implementing a risk management program.

N.D.A.G. Letter  September 10, 1992, to Helen Tracy
Information open to the public under N.D.C.C. § 65-05-325.

N.D.A.G. 85-23  June 12, 1985, to James Sperry
Information in minute record is confidential.

N.D.A.G. 67-354  August 23, 1967, to Agnes Geelan
Furnishing information to vocational rehabilitation agency.

N.D.A.G. 66-502  May 9, 1966, to E. Odin Sjaastad
Awards of benefits.

N.D.A.G. 64-287  June 8, 1964
Disclosure to tax commissioner.
Release of medical information.

N.D.A.G. 42-71  September 4, 1942
Confidential correspondence.

WORKING PAPERS

SEE PRELIMINARY DRAFTS AND WORKING PAPERS