



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 16, 2019

Mr. Lance Kennedy
Counsel for the City of Caddo Mills
Messer, Rockefeller & Fort, P.L.L.C.
6371 Preston Road, Suite 200
Frisco, Texas 75034

OR2019-10205

Dear Mr. Kennedy:

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# 759519 (ORR# CM101118JB).

The City of Caddo Mills (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to the city's airport. We note you have released some information. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.137 of the Government Code.¹ 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. 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

¹We note, and you acknowledge, the city did not comply with section 552.301 of the Government Code in requesting a ruling from this office. See Gov't Code § 552.301(b), (e). Nonetheless, because sections 552.101 and 552.137 of the Government Code can provide compelling reasons to overcome the presumption of openness, we will consider their applicability to the submitted information. See *id.* §§ 552.007, .302, .352.

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 that personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision No. 600 (1992) (public employee's withholding allowance certificate, designation of beneficiary of employee's retirement benefits, direct deposit authorization, and employee's decisions regarding voluntary benefits programs, among others, protected under common-law privacy). This office has also determined that a public employee's net pay is protected by common-law privacy even though it involves a financial transaction between the employee and the governmental body. *See* Attorney General Opinion GA-0572 at 3-5 (2007) (stating that net salary necessarily involves disclosure of information about personal financial decisions and is background financial information about a given individual that is not of legitimate concern to the public). However, there is a legitimate public interest in the essential facts about a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 9 (information revealing that employee participates in group insurance plan funded partly or wholly by governmental body is not excepted from disclosure), 545 (1990) (financial information pertaining to receipt of funds from governmental body or debts owed to governmental body not protected by common-law privacy).

Upon review, we find the information at issue satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information it has marked and the additional information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.137 excepts 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). Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). Section 552.137 does not apply to an institutional e-mail address, the general e-mail address of a business, an e-mail address of a person who has a contractual relationship with a governmental body, an e-mail address of a vendor who seeks to contract with a governmental body, an e-mail address maintained by a governmental entity for one of its officials or employees, or an e-mail address provided to a governmental body on a letterhead. *See id.* § 552.137(c). We are unable to determine whether the personal e-mail addresses within the remaining information at issue, which are located within e-mails communicating official business of the city, belong to city employees. Thus, we rule conditionally. To the extent the e-mail addresses within the remaining information are the personal e-mail addresses of city employees, or to the extent subsection (c) applies, this information is not subject to section 552.137 and may not be withheld on that basis. *See Austin Bulldog v. Leffingwell*, 490 S.W.3d 240 (Tex. App.—Austin 2016, no pet.) (holding personal e-mail addresses of government officials used to conduct official government business are not e-mail addresses of "members of the public" for purposes of Gov't Code § 552.137(a)). However, to the

extent the e-mail addresses within the remaining information are not the personal e-mail addresses of city employees and subsection (c) does not apply, this information is subject to section 552.137 and must be withheld under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners of the e-mail addresses affirmatively consent to their release.

In summary, the city must withhold the information it has marked and the additional information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. To the extent the e-mail addresses within the remaining information are not the personal e-mail addresses of city employees and subsection (c) does not apply, this information is subject to section 552.137 and must be withheld under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners of the e-mail addresses affirmatively consent to their release. 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,



Kelly McWethy
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KSM/gw

Ref: ID# 759519

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)