



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 13, 2017

Ms. Paige Saenz
Counsel for City of Leander
The Knight Law Firm
223 West Anderson Lane, Suite A-105
Austin, Texas 78752

OR2017-25914

Dear Ms. Saenz:

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# 683950.

The City of Leander (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for fourteen categories of information pertaining to payments made by the city, specified agreements, specified city policies, and the city manager for the city. We understand the city has no information responsive to a portion of the request.¹ We also understand the city has released some information. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.107, 552.117, and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have also received comments from the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released). We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

The Act is applicable only to "public information." *Id.* § 552.021. Section 552.002(a) of the Government Code defines "public information" as

¹The Act does not require a governmental body that receives a request for information to create information that did not exist when the request was received. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 563 at 8 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

information that is written, produced, collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business:

(1) by a governmental body;

(2) for a governmental body and the governmental body:

(A) owns the information;

(B) has a right of access to the information; or

(C) spends or contributes public money for the purpose of writing, producing, collecting, assembling, or maintaining the information; or

(3) by an individual officer or employee of a governmental body in the officer's or employee's official capacity and the information pertains to official business of the governmental body.

Id. § 552.002(a). Section 552.002(a-1) also provides the following:

Information is in connection with the transaction of official business if the information is created by, transmitted to, received by, or maintained by an officer or employee of the governmental body in the officer's or employee's official capacity, or a person or entity performing official business or a governmental function on behalf of a governmental body, and pertains to official business of the governmental body.

Id. § 552.002(a-1). Thus, virtually all of the information in a governmental body's physical possession constitutes public information and thus, is subject to the Act. *Id.* § 552.002(a)(1); *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 549 at 4 (1990), 514 at 1-2 (1988). You state the submitted information contains employee identification numbers of city employees. In Open Records Decision No. 581 (1990), this office determined certain computer information, such as source codes, documentation information, and other computer programming, that has no significance other than its use as a tool for the maintenance, manipulation, or protection of public property is not the kind of information made public under section 552.021 of the Government Code. You inform the employee identification numbers are "automatically created by the [c]ity's payroll software and used for tracking by that software." Based on your representation and our review, we agree the submitted employee identification numbers do not constitute public information for the purposes of section 552.002. Thus, the submitted employee identification numbers are not subject to the Act, and the city is not required to release them in response to the request for information.

Next, we must address the requestor's contention the city failed to comply with the procedural requirements a governmental body must follow in asking this office to decide

whether requested information is excepted from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301. Pursuant to section 552.301(b), a governmental body must ask for a decision from this office and state the exceptions that apply within ten business days of receiving the written request. *See id.* § 552.301(b). Additionally, pursuant to section 552.301(d) of the Government Code, a governmental body must, within ten business days of receiving the request for information, provide the requestor with (1) a written statement the governmental body wishes to withhold the requested information and has asked for a decision from the attorney general, and (2) a copy of the governmental body's written communication to the attorney general. *Id.* § 552.301(d). In this instance, you state the city received the request for information on August 24, 2017. You inform us the city was closed on September 4, 2017, in observance of Labor Day. We note this office does not count the date the request was received or holidays for the purpose of calculating a governmental body's deadlines under the Act. Accordingly, the city's ten-business-day deadline was September 8, 2017. The envelope containing the information required by section 552.301(b) is meter-marked September 8, 2017. *See id.* § 552.308(a)(1) (describing rules for calculating submission dates of documents sent via first class United States mail, common or contract carrier, or interagency mail). Additionally, we note the correspondence the city submitted to this office requesting a ruling reflects, and the requestor acknowledges, the requestor was copied on the correspondence. Consequently, we find the city complied with the requirements of section 552.301 in requesting a decision from this office.

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." *Id.* § 552.102(a). The Texas Supreme Court held section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). Accordingly, the city must withhold the employee's date of birth in the submitted information under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code.²

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. Section 552.101 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 or embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683.

This office has found that personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally intimate or

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

embarrassing. *See generally* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 9-10 (1992) (employee's withholding allowance certificate, designation of retirement beneficiary, choice of insurance carrier, election of optional coverages, direct deposit authorization, 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), 523 (1989) (common-law privacy protects credit reports, financial statements, and other personal financial information), 373 (1983) (sources of income not related to financial transaction between individual and governmental body protected under common-law privacy). However, there is a legitimate public interest in the essential facts about a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body. *See* ORDs 600 at 9 (information revealing employee participates in group insurance plan funded partly or wholly by governmental body is not excepted from disclosure), 545 (financial information pertaining to receipt of funds from governmental body or debts owed to governmental body not protected by common-law privacy). Whether the public's interest in obtaining personal financial information is sufficient to justify its disclosure must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See* ORD 373.

Upon review, we find the information we have marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must generally withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, it is not clear whether the listed payroll deductions and benefits reflect mandatory participation by the employees or are the employees' voluntary financial decisions. Thus, to the extent this information reflects the employees' voluntary allocations of salary to optional investment, retirement, or other financial programs offered by the city, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, to the extent the information at issue reflects the employees' mandatory participation in the city's retirement program or benefits paid by the city, the deduction amounts are not confidential and may not be withheld on that basis. In either instance, the city must withhold the remaining information we have marked 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 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.*, 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 C constitutes communications between an attorney for the city and city employees in their capacity as clients that were made for the purpose of providing legal services to the city. You state the communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find Exhibit C consists of privileged attorney-client communications the city may withhold under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, emergency contact information, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. Gov’t Code § 552.117(a)(1). Whether a particular piece of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time the request for it is made. *See Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989)*. Therefore, a governmental body must withhold information under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of current or former officials or employees only if these individuals made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for this information was made. You state, and have submitted documentation demonstrating, the employee whose information is at issue timely elected confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator’s or driver’s license or permit, a motor vehicle title or registration, or a personal identification document issued by an agency of Texas or another state or country is excepted

from public release. Gov't Code § 552.130(a). We conclude the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the submitted employee identification numbers are not subject to the Act, and the city is not required to release them in response to the request for information. The city must withhold the employee's date of birth in the submitted information under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. To the extent the information we have marked reflects the employee's voluntary allocations of salary to optional investment, retirement, or other financial programs offered by the city, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the remaining information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city may withhold Exhibit C under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information.

Finally, you ask this office to issue a previous determination permitting the city to withhold under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code the dates of birth of current and former employees of the city when the dates of birth are held in an employment context. *See id.* § 552.301(a) (allowing governmental body to withhold information subject to previous determination); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001). We decline to issue such a previous determination at this time. Accordingly, 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,



Matthew Taylor
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MHT/tdw

Ref: ID# 683950

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)