



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 7, 2017

Ms. Ileana Fernandez
Assistant City Attorney
Office of the City Attorney
City of Mesquite
P.O. Box 850137
Mesquite, Texas 75185-0137

OR2017-12540

Dear Ms. Fernandez:

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# 661061.

The City of Mesquite (the "city") received a request for all e-mails of a named city council member for a specified time period and the travel records of the same council member and the city mayor for a specified time period.¹ You state you have released some information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, 552.109, 552.117, 552.127, 552.131, 552.136, and 552.137 of the

¹We note the city sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also* *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding when governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification of unclear or overbroad request for public information, ten-business-day period to request attorney general opinion is measured from date request is clarified or narrowed). You state, and provide documentation demonstrating, the city sent the requestor a cost estimate of charges pursuant to section 552.2615 of the Government Code, and the requestor accepted the cost estimate. *See* Gov't Code § 552.2615. The estimate of charges required the requestor to provide a deposit for payment of anticipated costs under section 552.263 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.263(a). You also inform us the city received the required deposit on April 6, 2017. *See id.* § 552.263(e) (if governmental body requires deposit or bond for anticipated costs pursuant to section 552.263, request for information is considered to have been received on date governmental body receives bond or deposit).

Government Code.² We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. This section encompasses information protected by other statutes, including the Utilities Code. Section 182.052 of the Utilities Code provides, in relevant part, the following:

(a) Except as provided by Section 182.054, a government-operated utility may not disclose personal information in a customer’s account record, or any information relating to the volume or units of utility usage or the amounts billed to or collected from the individual for utility usage, if the customer requests that the government-operated utility keep the information confidential. However, a government-operated utility may disclose information related to the customer’s volume or units of utility usage or amounts billed to or collected from the individual for utility usage if the primary source of water for such utility was a sole-source designated aquifer.

(b) A customer may request confidentiality by delivering to the government-operated utility an appropriately marked form provided under Subsection (c)(3) or any other written request for confidentiality.

Util. Code § 182.052(a)-(b). “Personal information” under section 182.052(a) includes an individual’s address, telephone number, or social security number, but does not include an individual’s name. *See id.* § 182.051(4); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 625 (1994) (construing statutory predecessor). The scope of utility services covered by section 182.052 includes water. Util. Code § 182.051(3). Section 182.054 of the Utilities Code provides six exceptions to the disclosure prohibition found in section 182.052. *See id.* § 182.054.

You state portions of Exhibit 7 consist of the personal information of residential utility customers who timely requested confidentiality under section 182.052 of the Utilities Code. You do not indicate any of the exceptions to confidentiality under section 182.054 of the Utilities Code apply in this instance. You state the primary source of water for the city’s utility services is not a sole-source designated aquifer. Based on your representations and our review, we find the city must withhold the information you marked in Exhibit 7 under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 182.052 of the Utilities Code.

²Although you claim section 552.1175 of the Government Code for portions of the submitted information, section 552.117 is the proper exception to raise in this instance because the city holds the submitted information in an employment context.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the common-law informer's privilege, which Texas courts have long recognized. *See Aguilar v. State*, 444 S.W.2d 935, 937 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969). The informer's privilege protects from disclosure the identities of persons who report activities over which the governmental body has criminal or quasi-criminal law-enforcement authority. *See Open Records Decision No. 208* at 1-2 (1978). The informer's privilege protects the identities of individuals who report violations of statutes to the police or similar law-enforcement agencies, as well as those who report violations of statutes with civil or criminal penalties to "administrative officials having a duty of inspection or of law enforcement within their particular spheres." *Open Records Decision No. 279* at 1-2 (1981) (citing 8 John H. Wigmore, *Evidence in Trials at Common Law*, § 2374, at 767 (J. McNaughton Rev. Ed. 1961)). The report must be of a violation of a criminal or civil statute. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 582* at 2 (1990), 515 at 4 (1988). The privilege excepts the informer's statement only to the extent necessary to protect that informer's identity. *Open Records Decision No. 549* at 5 (1990). We note the informer's privilege does not apply where the informant's identity is known to the individual who is the subject of the complaint. *See ORD 208* at 1-2.

You state portions of Exhibit 6 identify complainants who reported possible criminal and city ordinance violations to the city. You explain the city is responsible for enforcing the relevant portions of the city ordinances and laws. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the common-law informer's privilege to some of the information at issue. Therefore, the city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law informer's privilege. However, you do not inform us, and we are unable to determine, which law was allegedly violated or whether the alleged violation at issue carries criminal or civil penalties for the remaining information. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). 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 concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See Open Records Decision No. 455* (1987). Additionally, this office has found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 600* (1992) (designation of beneficiary of employee's retirement benefits, direct deposit authorization, and forms allowing employee to allocate pretax compensation to group insurance, health care or dependent care), 545 (1990) (deferred compensation information, participation in voluntary investment program, election of optional insurance coverage, mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history). However, this office has also found the public has a

legitimate interest in information relating to employees of governmental bodies and their employment qualifications and job performance. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 at 4 (1987) (public has legitimate interest in job qualifications and performance of public employees), 405 at 2-3 (1983) (public has interest in manner in which public employee performs job). Additionally, this office has concluded the public has a legitimate interest in information that relates to public employees and their conduct in the workplace. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 562 at 10 (1990) (personnel file information does not involve most intimate aspects of human affairs but in fact touches on matters of legitimate public concern), 470 at 4 (1987) (job performance does not generally constitute public employee's private affairs), 444 at 3 (1986) (public has obvious interest in information concerning qualifications and performance of government employees), 405 at 2 (1983) (manner in which public employee's job was performed cannot be said to be of minimal public interest), 392 (1982) (reasons for employee's resignation ordinarily not private). In addition, we note the public has a legitimate public interest in the details of a crime. *See* Open Records Decision No. 400 at 4 (1983). *See generally* *Lowe v. Hearst Communications, Inc.*, 487 F.3d 246, 250 (5th Cir. 2007) (noting "legitimate public interest in facts tending to support an allegation of criminal activity" (citing *Cinel v. Connick*, 15 F.3d 1338, 1345-46 (1994))). Upon review, we find portions of the information at issue satisfy the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Thus, with the exception of the information we marked for release, the city must withhold the information you marked and the additional information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.³ However, we find you have failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information constitutes highly intimate or embarrassing information that is of no legitimate concern to the public. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body has the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate that the information constitutes or documents a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made "to facilitate the rendition of professional legal services" to the client governmental body. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). The privilege does not apply when an attorney or representative is involved in some capacity other than that of providing or facilitating professional legal services to the client governmental body. *In re Tex. Farmers Ins. Exch.*, 990 S.W.2d 337, 340 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1999, orig. proceeding) (attorney-client privilege does not apply if attorney acting in a capacity other than that of attorney). Governmental attorneys often act in capacities other than that of professional legal counsel, such as administrators, investigators, or managers. Thus, the mere fact that a communication involves an attorney for the

³As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

government does not demonstrate this element. Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1)(A), (B), (C), (D), (E). Thus, a governmental body must inform this office of the identities and capacities of the individuals to whom each communication at issue has been made. Lastly, the attorney-client privilege applies only to a confidential communication, *id.* 503(b)(1), meaning it was “not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those: (A) to whom disclosure is made to further the rendition of professional legal services to the client; or (B) reasonably necessary to transmit the communication.” *Id.* 503(a)(5). Whether a communication meets this definition depends on the intent of the parties involved at the time the information was communicated. *Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, orig. proceeding). Moreover, because the client may elect to waive the privilege at any time, a governmental body must explain that the confidentiality of a communication has been maintained. Section 552.107(1) generally excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege unless otherwise waived by the governmental body. *See Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein).

You state Exhibit 8 consists of communications involving privileged parties. You state the communications were made in confidence for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the city and these communications have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to Exhibit 8. Thus, the city may withhold Exhibit 8 under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.109 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[p]rivate correspondence or communications of an elected office holder relating to matters the disclosure of which would constitute an invasion of privacy[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.109. This office has held the test to be applied to information under section 552.109 is the same as the common-law privacy standard under section 552.101, as discussed. *Indus. Found.* 540 S.W.2d at 682. Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information constitutes highly intimate or embarrassing information that is of no legitimate concern to the public. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.109 of the Government Code.

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 whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the city must withhold the information you marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. Conversely, to the extent the individual at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024, the city may not withhold the marked information under section 552.117(a)(1).

Section 552.127 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information that “identifies a person as a participant in a neighborhood crime watch organization and relates to the name, home address, business address, home telephone number, or business telephone number of the person.” Gov’t Code § 552.127(a); *see also id.* § 552.127(b) (defining “neighborhood crime watch organization” as “a group of residents of a neighborhood or part of a neighborhood that is formed in affiliation or association with a law enforcement agency in this state to observe activities within the neighborhood or part of a neighborhood and to take actions intended to reduce crime in that area.”). You seek to withhold some of the information in Exhibit 10 under section 552.127. You assert the information you marked identifies individuals who are members of neighborhood crime watch organizations. Upon review, we find the city must withhold the information you marked and the additional information we marked under section 552.127 of the Government Code.⁴

Section 552.131 of the Government Code relates to economic development information and provides in part:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if the information relates to economic development negotiations involving a governmental body and a business prospect that the governmental body seeks to have locate, stay, or expand in or near the territory of the governmental body and the information relates to:

- (1) a trade secret of the business prospect; or
- (2) commercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that disclosure would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained.

Id. § 552.131(a). Section 552.131(a) excepts from disclosure only “trade secret[s] of [a] business prospect” and “commercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that disclosure would cause substantial competitive harm

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

to the person from whom the information was obtained.” *Id.* § 552.131(a). We note section 552.131(a) does not protect the interests of a governmental body regarding the release of information pertaining to economic development negotiations. Thus, we do not address your arguments under section 552.131(a) for the information at issue. Further, we have not received arguments from any third party explaining how the responsive information contains the third party’s trade secrets or its commercial or financial information. *See id.* § 552.305(d)(2)(B). Because no third party has demonstrated the information at issue qualifies as a trade secret or release of the information at issue would result in substantial competitive harm, we conclude none of the information at issue may be withheld pursuant to section 552.131(a).

Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides, “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential.” *Id.* § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). Accordingly, the city must withhold the utility account number you marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code exempts from disclosure “an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body” unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). *See id.* § 552.137(a)-(c). Upon review, we find some of the e-mail addresses the city marked are maintained by a governmental entity for its employees. These e-mail addresses, which we have marked for release, may not be withheld under section 552.137 of the Government Code. The remaining e-mail addresses are not excluded by subsection (c). *See id.* § 552.137(a)-(c). Therefore, with the exception of the e-mail addresses we have marked for release, the city must withhold the personal e-mail addresses you marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure.

In summary, the city must withhold the information you marked in Exhibit 7 under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 182.052 of the Utilities Code. The city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law informer’s privilege. With the exception of the information we marked for release, the city must withhold the information you marked and the additional information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city may withhold Exhibit 8 under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. To the extent the individual whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the city must withhold the information you marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information you marked and the additional information we marked under section 552.127 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the utility account number you marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. Except for the e-mail addresses we have marked for release, the city must withhold the personal e-mail addresses you marked under section 552.137 of the

Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure. The city must release the remaining information.

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,



Jahanna Ward
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JW/som

Ref: ID# 661061

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)