



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 11, 2017

Ms. Halfreda Anderson-Nelson
Public Information Officer
Dallas Area Rapid Transit
P.O. Box 660163
Dallas, Texas 75266-0163

OR2017-28030

Dear Ms. Anderson-Nelson:

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# 687290 (ORR #W002059-092217).

Dallas Area Rapid Transit ("DART") received a request for certain information pertaining to a specified accident involving the requestor's client. You state DART released some information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, you state DART sought clarification from the requestor with respect to a portion of the request. *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 that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or overbroad request for information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed). You also state DART has not received a response from the requestor for this portion of the request. Thus, for the portion of the request for which you have sought but have not received clarification, we find DART is not required to release information in response to this portion of the request. However, if the requestor clarifies this portion of the request for information, DART must seek a ruling from this office before withholding any responsive information from the requestor. *See* Gov't Code

§ 552.222; *City of Dallas*, 304 S.W.3d at 387. We note a governmental body has a duty to make a good-faith effort to relate a request for information to information the governmental body holds. Open Records Decision No. 561 (1990).

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, such as section 452.061 of the Transportation Code. DART is a regional transportation authority governed by chapter 452 of the Transportation Code. *See* Transp. Code ch. 452; *see also id.* § 452.001(1) (defining “authority” for purposes of chapter 452 of the Transportation Code). Section 452.061 of the Transportation Code provides in relevant part:

(e) Personal identifying information collected by an authority is confidential and not subject to disclosure under [the Act], including a person’s:

- (1) name, address, e-mail address, and phone number;
- (2) account number, password, payment transaction activity, toll or charge record, or credit, debit, or other payment card number; and
- (3) other personal financial information.

Id. § 452.061(e). You assert the submitted information consists of personal identifying information made confidential by subsection 452.061(e). We note subsection 452.061(e) is contained in section 452.061, which is titled “Fares and Other Charges.” Additionally, subsections (a) through (d) of section 452.061 discuss an authority’s responsibilities in imposing fares and other charges and the state’s power to regulate taxes imposed by an authority or other compensation authorized by this section. *See id.* § 452.061(a)–(d). Accordingly, we conclude subsection 452.061(e) is only applicable to personal identifying information collected by DART for purposes relating to the collection of fares and other charges. *Cf. Paxton v. Tex. Dep’t of State Health Servs.*, 500 S.W.3d 702, 706 (Tex. App.—Austin 2016, no pet.) (holding although isolated reading of section 531.1021(g) of Government Code suggests it applies to any Office of Inspector General (“OIG”) investigation, confidentiality of OIG investigations provided by section 531.1021(g) must be read in context of OIG’s enabling provisions and thus, extended only to OIG investigations concerning fraud, waste, and abuse in the provision and delivery of health and human services in the state). Upon review, we find DART did not collect the personal identifying information at issue for purposes relating to the collection of fares and other charges. Consequently, the submitted information is not confidential under subsection 452.061(e) of the Transportation Code, and DART may not withhold it under section 552.101 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 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 embarrassing. *See generally* Open Records Decision Nos. 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). Additionally, the Third Court of Appeals has concluded public citizens' dates of birth are protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *See Paxton v. City of Dallas*, No. 03-13-00546-CV, 2015 WL 3394061, at *3 (Tex. App.—Austin May 22, 2015, pet. denied) (mem. op.). Upon review, we find the marked information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, DART must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's license, driver's license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release.¹ *See* Gov't Code § 552.130. Accordingly, DART must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code states, in part, “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, 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 also id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). This office has determined an insurance policy number is an access device number for the purposes of section 552.136. *See* Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009). Accordingly, DART must withhold the insurance policy number we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

¹The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

In summary, DART must withhold the information we have marked under (1) section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy; (2) section 552.130 of the Government Code; and (3) section 552.136 of the Government Code. DART must release the remaining information.

DART also asks this office to issue a previous determination that would authorize it to withhold personal identifying information collected by DART under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 452.061 of the Transportation Code without seeking a ruling from this office. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (listing elements of second type of previous determination under section 552.301(a) of the Government Code). In the alternative, DART asks this office to issue a previous determination that would authorize it to release personal identifying information collected by DART. We decline to issue such a previous determination with respect to either request 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,



Cole Hutchison
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CH/sb

Ref: ID# 687290

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)