



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 2, 2018

Ms. Ann-Marie Sheely
Assistant County Attorney
Travis County Attorney's Office
P.O. Box 1748
Austin, Texas 78767

OR2018-02395

Dear Ms. Sheely:

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# 694067 (ID# 547375-1).

The Travis County Clerk's Office (the "county") received a request for specified information pertaining to the requestor or staffing of election polling locations. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, you inform us the county does not have information responsive to most of the request. The Act does not require a governmental body that receives a request for information to answer general questions, perform legal research, or create new 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). However, a governmental body must make a good-faith effort to relate to a request to information that is within its possession or control. *See Open Records Decision No. 561 at 8-9 (1990)*. As you have submitted information for our review, we presume the county has made a good faith effort to relate the information requested to information the county maintains. Further, although you assert a portion of the submitted information is not responsive to the request, we find all the submitted information is responsive. Thus, the county must release the information at issue unless it is excepted from release under the Act. Accordingly, we will address your arguments against release of the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code exempts 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 section 32.076 of the Election Code, which provides as follows:

(a) Except as provided by Subsection (b), an e-mail address or personal phone number of an election judge or clerk collected or maintained by the authority conducting the election is confidential and does not constitute public information for purposes of [the Act],

(b) An e-mail address or phone number described by Subsection (a) shall be made available on request to:

(1) any entity eligible to submit lists of election judges or clerks for that election; or

(2) the state executive committee of a political party with a county chair eligible to submit lists of election judges or clerks for that election.

Elec. Code § 32.076. You state the e-mail addresses and telephone numbers you marked consist of the personal e-mail addresses and telephone numbers of election judges or clerks collected or maintained by the county pursuant to its authority conducting an election. You further state none of the exceptions in section 32.076(b) apply in this instance. Upon review, we find the information you marked, and the additional information we marked, is confidential under section 32.076 of the Election Code and must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code.¹

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. We note, however, the public generally has a legitimate interest in information that relates to public employment and public employees. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 542 (1990), 470 at 4 (1987) (public has legitimate interest in job qualifications and performance of public employees), 444 at 5-6 (1986) (public has legitimate interest in knowing reasons for dismissal, demotion, promotion, or resignation of public employees), 432 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow). Upon review, we find you have not

¹As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of a portion of this information.

demonstrated any of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the county may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.111 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[a]n interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.111. This exception encompasses the deliberative process privilege. *See* Open Records Decision No. 615 at 2 (1993). The purpose of section 552.111 is to protect advice, opinion, and recommendation in the decisional process and to encourage open and frank discussion in the deliberative process. *See Austin v. City of San Antonio*, 630 S.W.2d 391, 394 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1982, writ ref’d n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 538 at 1-2 (1990).

In Open Records Decision No. 615 (1993), this office re-examined the statutory predecessor to section 552.111 in light of the decision in *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ). We determined that section 552.111 excepts from disclosure only those internal communications that consist of advice, recommendations, opinions, and other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the governmental body. *See* ORD 615 at 5. A governmental body’s policymaking functions do not encompass routine internal administrative or personnel matters, and disclosure of information about such matters will not inhibit free discussion of policy issues among agency personnel. *Id.*; *see also City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351 (Tex. 2000) (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking). A governmental body’s policymaking functions do include administrative and personnel matters of broad scope that affect the governmental body’s policy mission. *See* Open Records Decision No. 631 at 3 (1995). Additionally, section 552.111 does not generally except from disclosure purely factual information that is severable from the opinion portions of internal memoranda. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.); ORD 615 at 4-5. But if factual information is so inextricably intertwined with material involving advice, opinion, or recommendation as to make severance of the factual data impractical, the factual information also may be withheld under section 552.111. *See* Open Records Decision No. 313 at 3 (1982).

You assert the information you marked consists of advice, recommendations, and opinions regarding policymaking decisions of the county. Upon review, however, we find the remaining information is either factual in nature or consists of internal administrative or personnel matters that do not rise to the level of policymaking. Therefore, we find the county has failed to demonstrate the remaining information constitutes internal communications containing advice, recommendations, or opinions reflecting the policymaking processes of the county. Accordingly, none of the remaining information at issue may be withheld under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

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.² See Gov't Code § 552.130. Accordingly, the county must withhold the motor vehicle record information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the county must withhold the information marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 32.076 of the Election Code. The county must withhold the information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The county 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,



Ramsey A. Abarca
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

RAA/gw

Ref: ID# 694067

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

²The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).