



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 24, 2017

Ms. Akilah Mance
Counsel for the City of Waller
Olson & Olson, LLP
Wortham Tower, Suite 600
2727 Allen Parkway, Suite 600
Houston, Texas 77019-2133

OR2017-08658

Dear Ms. Mance:

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# 654624 (PIR# COW17-003).

The City of Waller (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for various police training materials, manuals, and directives, police dispatch logs and communications made during a specified time period, all documents pertaining to a specified bid project, the annual audit for three specified years, the employee file for a named individual, and all documents related to a specified project. You state you have released some information to the requestor. You state the city will redact certain information pursuant to sections 552.130(c), 552.136(c), and 552.147(b) of the Government Code and under section 552.137 of the Government Code in accordance with Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).¹ You state some information is not subject to the Act. You claim portions of the remaining information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.103, 552.104, and 552.108 of the

¹Section 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 552.136 of the Government Code permits a governmental body to withhold the information described in section 552.136(b) without the necessity of seeking a decision from this office. *See id.* § 552.136(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.136(e). *See id.* § 552.136(d), (e). Open Records Decision No. 684 serves as a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information, including personal e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision. 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. *See id.* § 552.147(b).

Government Code. Additionally, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified a named individual and entity of the request of information and of their rights to submit arguments to this office as to why the information at issue should not be released.² *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released), .305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in the Act in certain circumstances). We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.³

You assert the Texas Municipal Human Resources Association ("TMHRA") ID Number contained in the submitted documents is not subject to the Act. The Act applies only to "public information." *See* Gov't Code § 552.021. Section 552.002(a) defines "public information" as:

[I]nformation 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.

Id. § 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,

²We have not received comments from the named individual.

³We assume the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

manipulation, or protection of public property is not the kind of information made public under section 552.021 of the Government Code. You inform our office the TMHRA number is a “unique computer-generated number assigned to members for identification in the TMHRA database, and may be used as an access device number on the website along with the assigned password.” Based on your representations and our review, we find the TMHRA number and password you marked do not constitute public information under section 552.002 of the Government Code. Therefore, we conclude the TMHRA number and password are not subject to the Act, and the city is not required to release this information to the requestor.

Next, we note some of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022 provides, in relevant part, the following:

(a) [T]he following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

...

(3) information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of public or other funds by a governmental body[.]

Id. § 552.022(a)(3). The remaining information includes information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of funds by a governmental body that is subject to section 552.022(a)(3). The city must release this information pursuant to section 552.022(a)(3), unless it is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* Although the city raises section 552.103 of the Government Code for this information, section 552.103 is discretionary in nature and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); Open Record Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions), 473 (1987) (section 552.103 may be waived). Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the information subject to section 552.022(a)(3) under section 552.103. However, as information encompassed by section 552.022 may be withheld under section 552.104, we will consider your argument under section 552.104 for the information subject to section 552.022(a)(3). *See Gov't Code* § 552.104(b) (information protected by section 552.104 not subject to required public disclosure under section 552.022(a)). Additionally, we will address the city's argument against disclosure of the remaining information.

Section 552.104(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder.” *Id.* § 552.104(a). The “test under section 552.104 is whether knowing another bidder's [or competitor's information] would be an advantage, not whether it would be a decisive advantage.” *Boeing Co. v. Paxton*, 466

S.W.3d 831 (Tex. 2015). The city states the information it marked relates to an ongoing competition or bidding for services. You explain the information at issue includes “completed bids and related bid information for the same or similar type of projects and goods that are reoccurring in the [c]ity.” In addition, the city states release of the information at issue would “present a clear threat of harm to the city’s ability to obtain the lowest bid possible in the current and future related bidding process.” After review of the information at issue and consideration of the arguments, we find the city has established release of the information at issue, including the information subject to section 552.022(a)(3), would give advantage to a competitor or bidder. Thus, we conclude the city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.104(a).

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides in relevant part as follows:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person’s office or employment, is or may be a party.

...

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov’t Code § 552.103(a), (c). The governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received the request for information and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, orig. proceeding); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref’d n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). The governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a).

The city states it is a party to pending litigation. The city explains, and provides documentation demonstrating, that a lawsuit styled *Al Whitelaw v. Michael Williams*, Case No. 17-CV-0206, was pending in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas, Houston Division prior to the city’s receipt of this request for information. Therefore, we agree litigation was pending on the date the city received the present request for information. You also state portions of the remaining information are related to the pending litigation because the information was part of the discovery requests. Based on your

representations and our review, we find the information at issue is related to the pending litigation. Therefore, the city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.103 of the Government Code.⁴

However, once the information has been obtained by all parties to the pending litigation, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. Open Records Decision No. 349 at 2 (1982). We also note the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has concluded. See Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision Nos. 350 at 3 (1982).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code. Prior decisions of this office have held section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code renders federal tax return information confidential. See Open Records Decision No. 600 (1992) (W-4 forms). Section 6103(b) defines the term “return information” as “a taxpayer’s identity, the nature, source, or amount of his income, payments, receipts, deductions, exemptions, credits, assets, liabilities, net worth, tax liability, tax withheld, deficiencies, overassessments, or tax payments . . . or any other data, received by, recorded by, prepared by, furnished to, or collected by the Secretary [of the Treasury] with respect to a return or with respect to the determination of the existence, or possible existence, of liability . . . for any tax, penalty, interest, fine, forfeiture, or other imposition, or offense[.]” See 26 U.S.C. § 6103(b)(2)(A). Federal courts have construed the term “return information” expansively to include any information gathered by the Internal Revenue Service regarding a taxpayer’s liability under title 26 of the United States Code. See *Mallas v. Kolak*, 721 F. Supp. 748, 754 (M.D.N.C. 1989), *aff’d in part*, 993 F.2d 1111 (4th Cir. 1993). Thus, the submitted W-4 forms constitute tax return information that is confidential under section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code and must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

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). We understand the city to assert the privacy analysis under section 552.102(a) is the same as the common-law privacy test under section 552.101 of the Government Code. 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 of the Government Code encompasses common-law privacy, which protects information if it (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex.*

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

Indus. Accident Bd., 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). In *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Texas Newspapers, Inc.*, 652 S.W.2d 546, 549-51 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref'd n.r.e.), the court of appeals ruled the privacy test under section 552.102(a) is the same as the *Industrial Foundation* privacy test. However, the Texas Supreme Court has expressly disagreed with *Hubert's* interpretation of section 552.102(a) and held the privacy standard under section 552.102(a) differs from the *Industrial Foundation* test under section 552.101. See *Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). The supreme court also considered the applicability of section 552.102(a) and held it excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. See *id.* at 348. Thus, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.102(a).

As stated above, section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects the specific types of information the Texas Supreme Court held to be intimate or embarrassing in *Industrial Foundation* and is subject to the two-part test described above. See 540 S.W.2d at 685. To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. This office has found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally highly intimate or embarrassing. See Open Records Decision No. 600 (1992) (personal financial information includes choice of a particular insurance carrier). Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. See Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). Upon review, we find the information we marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Thus, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find the remaining information is either not highly intimate or embarrassing or is of legitimate public interest. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of common-law privacy.

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home address and telephone number, emergency contact information, social security number, and family member information of a current or former employee or official of a governmental body who requests this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. See Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). Whether a particular item of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. See Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Thus, information may be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) only on behalf of a current or former employee or official who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. Information may not be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee or official who did not timely request under section 552.024 the information be kept confidential. Therefore, to the extent the individual at issue timely

requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code.

In summary, the TMHRA number and password are not subject to the Act, and the city is not required to release this information to the requestor. The city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.104(a). The city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.103 of the Government Code. The submitted W-4 form must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code. The city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.102(a). The city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. To the extent the individual at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at 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,



Emily Buchanan
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

EB/eb

Ref: ID# 654624

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

