



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 16, 2019

Mr. James Kopp
Assistant City Attorney
City of San Antonio
315 South Santa Rosa Avenue, 6th Floor
San Antonio, Texas 78207

OR2019-13152

Dear Mr. Kopp:

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# 765763 (COSA File No. W253982).

The City of San Antonio (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified call for service report. You claim portions of the submitted information are exempted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

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 a personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is exempted from public release. Gov't Code § 552.130. Upon review, we find the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.¹

Section 552.101 of the Government Code exempts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." *Id.* § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses information protected by the federal Driver's Privacy Protection Act of 1994 (the "DPPA"), section 2721 of title 18 of the United States Code. Section 2721 provides, in part:

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

(a) In general.—A State department of motor vehicles, and any officer, employee, or contractor thereof, shall not knowingly disclose or otherwise make available to any person or entity:

(1) personal information, as defined in 18 U.S.C. 2725(3), about any individual obtained by the department in connection with a motor vehicle record, except as provided in subsection (b) of this section[.]

...

(b) Permissible uses.—Personal information referred to in subsection (a) . . . may be disclosed as follows:

(1) For use by any government agency . . . in carrying out its functions[.]

...

(c) Resale or redisclosure.—An authorized recipient of personal information (except a recipient under subsection (b)(11) or (12)) may resell or redisclose the information only for a use permitted under subsection (b) (but not for uses under subsection (b)(11) or (12)). . . . Any authorized recipient (except a recipient under subsection (b)(11)) that resells or rediscloses personal information covered by this chapter must keep for a period of 5 years records identifying each person or entity that receives information and the permitted purpose for which the information will be used and must make such records available to the motor vehicle department upon request.

18 U.S.C. § 2721(a)(1), (b)(1), (c). The DPPA defines “motor vehicle record,” in relevant part, as “any record that pertains to a motor vehicle operator’s permit . . . issued by a department of motor vehicles[.]” *Id.* § 2725(1). Section 2725 also defines personal information as “information that identifies an individual, including an individual’s photograph, social security number, driver identification number, name, address (but not the 5-digit zip code), telephone number, and medical or disability information, but does not include information on vehicular accidents, driving violations, and driver’s status.” *See id.* § 2725(3).

The city asserts some of the remaining information contains personal information obtained from the Texas Department of Public Safety (“DPS”) that is protected under the DPPA. We note this office has concluded that the DPPA applies to information in the possession of DPS. Attorney General Opinion JC-0499 at 1 (2002). The city explains its police department officers obtained the personal information for use in carrying out its functions with regard to law enforcement. Based upon the city’s representations and our review, we

find the city, in obtaining personal information from DPS to assist the city in carrying out its law enforcement functions, is an authorized recipient of personal information for purposes of section 2721(c). *See* 18 U.S.C. § 2721(b)(1) (providing that personal information may be disclosed by a state department of motor vehicles to any entity acting on behalf of a Federal, State, or local agency in carrying out its functions). Therefore, we conclude some of the remaining information the city seeks to withhold is personal information obtained from DPS by an authorized recipient and is confidential under section 2721 of title 18 of the United States Code. Accordingly, as we have no indication that release of this information would be for a use permitted under section 2721(b), we conclude the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 2721(a) of title 18 of the United States Code. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 2721(a)(1). However, we note the remaining information the city seeks to withhold does not consist of personal information for purposes of section 2725(3). *See id* § 2725(3). Accordingly, we find the remaining information is not confidential under section 2721(a) of title 18 of the United States Code and may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses chapter 772 of the Health and Safety Code, which authorizes the development of local emergency communication districts. Sections 772.118, 772.218, and 772.318 of the Health and Safety Code are applicable to emergency 9-1-1 districts established in accordance with chapter 772. *See* Open Records Decision No. 649 (1996). These sections make the originating telephone numbers and addresses of 9-1-1 callers furnished by a service supplier confidential. *Id.* at 2. Section 772.118 applies to an emergency communication district for a county with a population of more than two million. Section 772.218 applies to an emergency communication district for a county with a population of more than 860,000. Section 772.318 applies to an emergency communication district for a county with a population of more than 20,000.

We understand the city is part of an emergency communication district established under section 772.218 of the Health and Safety Code. The city indicates the telephone number it has marked is the originating telephone number of a 9-1-1 caller. Provided the information at issue was furnished by a service supplier, we agree the city must withhold the telephone number it marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 772.218 of the Health and Safety Code.

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. The types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at

683. This office has found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992) (employee's 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), 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). 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.). However, we note the individuals at issue have now been de-identified and their privacy interests will therefore be protected. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of common-law privacy.

Section 552.136(b) 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.”² Gov't Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). This office has concluded insurance policy numbers constitute access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. Accordingly, the city must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked in the remaining information under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 2721(a) of title 18 of the United States Code. Provided the telephone number was furnished by a service supplier, the city must withhold the telephone number you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 772.218 of the Health and Safety Code. The city must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked in the remaining information under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information.³

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

³We note the requestor has a right of access to some of the information being released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a) (governmental body may not deny access to person to whom information relates or person's agent on ground that information is considered confidential by privacy principles); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individuals request information concerning themselves).

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Erin Groff". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Erin Groff
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

EMG/gw

Ref: ID# 765763

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)