



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 23, 2019

Ms. Allison A. Bastian
Counsel for the City of Harlingen
Denton Navarro Rocha Bernal & Zech, P.C.
701 East Harrison, Suite 100
Harlingen, Texas 78550-9165

OR2019-20117

Dear Ms. Bastian:

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# 776565.

The City of Harlingen (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for every e-mail received by a named city official during a stated time period. You state the city has released some information to the requestor. You claim portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.104, 552.105, 552.106, 552.108, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the claimed exceptions and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, although you have marked some information as not responsive, we note this information is included within e-mails received by the named city official during the stated time period. Upon review, we find the entirety of the submitted information is responsive to the instant request for information. However, we will consider your arguments against disclosure of the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public 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 58.008 of the Family Code, which provides, in part, the following:

(b) Except as provided by Subsection (d), law enforcement records concerning a child and information concerning a child that are stored by electronic means or otherwise from which a record could be generated may not be disclosed to the public and shall be:

(1) if maintained on paper or microfilm, kept separate from adult records;

(2) if maintained electronically in the same computer system as adult records, accessible only under controls that are separate and distinct from the controls to access electronic data concerning adults; and

(3) maintained on a local basis only and not sent to a central state or federal depository, except as provided by Subsection (c) or Subchapter B, D, or E.

Fam. Code § 58.008(b); *see also id.* § 51.03(a)-(b) (defining “delinquent conduct” and “conduct indicating a need for supervision” for purposes of title 3 of Family Code). Section 58.008(b) is applicable to records of juvenile conduct that occurred before, on, or after September 1, 2017.¹ The juvenile must have been at least 10 years old and less than 17 years of age when the conduct occurred. *See id.* § 51.02(2) (defining “child” for purposes of title 3 of Family Code). We note section 58.008(b) applies only to law enforcement records that involve a juvenile as a suspect, offender, or defendant. You assert the information you marked is subject to section 58.008(b) of the Family Code. Upon review, however, we find the information at issue does not constitute juvenile law enforcement records for purposes of section 58.008(b). Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.008(b) of the Family Code.

Section 552.104(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder.” Gov’t Code § 552.104(a). The “test under section 552.104 is whether knowing another bidder’s [or competitor’s information] would be an advantage, not whether it would be a decisive advantage.” *Boeing Co. v. Paxton*, 466 S.W.3d 831, 841 (Tex. 2015). You inform us the city has a specific marketplace interest in the information at issue because the city is competing with other cities to attract companies and certain projects to the city. You explain the information at issue pertains to economic development matters, competitive matters, and city incentives regarding certain companies. In addition, you state release of the information at issue would give advantage to a competitor or bidder. Based upon your representations and our review,

¹Although you raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.007(c) of the Family Code, we note the 85th Legislature repealed this provision effective September 1, 2017. *See Act of May 28, 2017, 85th Leg., R.S., ch. 746 (S.B. 1304), § 21.*

we find the city has demonstrated it has specific marketplace interests and may be considered a “competitor” for purposes of section 552.104. Further, we find the city has established the release of the information at issue would give advantage to a competitor or bidder. Accordingly, we conclude the city may withhold the information you marked under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code.²

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, 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 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; *see also City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351, 364 (Tex. 2000); *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.). 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). However, 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. ORD 615 at 5-6; *see also Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d at 364 (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking).

Further, section 552.111 does not protect facts and written observations of facts and events severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *See Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 37 S.W.3d at 157; ORD 615 at 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).

This office has also concluded a preliminary draft of a document intended for public release in its final form necessarily represents the drafter’s advice, opinion, and recommendation

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

with regard to the form and content of the final document, so as to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.111. *See* Open Records Decision No. 559 at 2 (1990) (applying statutory predecessor). Section 552.111 protects factual information in the draft that also will be included in the final version of the document. *See id.* at 2-3. Thus, section 552.111 encompasses the entire contents, including comments, underlining, deletions, and proofreading marks, of a preliminary draft of a policymaking document that will be released to the public in its final form. *See id.* at 2.

Section 552.111 can also encompass communications between a governmental body and a third party, including a consultant or other party with a privity of interest. *See* Open Records Decision No. 561 at 9 (1990) (section 552.111 encompasses communications with party with which governmental body has privity of interest or common deliberative process). For section 552.111 to apply, the governmental body must identify the third party and explain the nature of its relationship with the governmental body. Section 552.111 is not applicable to a communication between the governmental body and a third party unless the governmental body establishes it has a privity of interest or common deliberative process with the third party. *See id.* We note a governmental body does not have a privity of interest or common deliberative process with a private party with which the governmental body is engaged in contract negotiations. *See id.* (Section 552.111 not applicable to communication with entity with which governmental body has no privity of interest or common deliberative process).

You state the information you marked consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations of the city regarding policymaking matters. You inform us the information at issue includes a draft document. We understand this document is intended for public release in its final form. Based upon your representations and our review, we find some of the information at issue, which we marked, consists of advice, opinions, or recommendations on the policymaking matters of the city. Accordingly, the city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code.³ However, we find the remaining information at issue consists of either general administrative information that does not relate to policymaking, information that is purely factual in nature, or information that reflects communications with parties with whom the city has not demonstrated it shares a privity of interest. Thus, we conclude you failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue constitutes internal communications containing advice, recommendations, or opinions reflecting the policymaking processes of the city. Therefore, the city may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.111 of the Government 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

³As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

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 the names, addresses, and telephone numbers of members of the public are generally not highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 551 at 3 (1990) (disclosure of person's name, address, or telephone number not an invasion of privacy), 455 at 7 (1987) (home addresses and telephone numbers not protected under privacy). However, this office has determined common-law privacy generally protects the identities of juvenile offenders. *See* Open Records Decision No. 394 (1983); *cf.* Fam. Code § 58.008(b). Upon review, we find some of the remaining information, which we marked, satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find you have not demonstrated any of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing to an identifiable individual and not of legitimate public concern. Therefore, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.106 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[a] draft or working paper involved in the preparation of proposed legislation.” Gov’t Code § 552.106(a). Section 552.106(a) ordinarily applies only to persons with a responsibility to prepare information and proposals for a legislative body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 460 at 1 (1987). The purpose of this exception is to encourage frank discussion on policy matters between the subordinates or advisors of a legislative body and the members of the legislative body; therefore, section 552.106 encompasses only policy judgments, recommendations, and proposals involved in the preparation of proposed legislation and does not except purely factual information from public disclosure. *Id.* at 2. We note sections 552.106 and 552.111 are similar in that they both protect advice, opinion, and recommendation on policy matters in order to encourage frank discussion during the policymaking process. *Id.* at 3. However, section 552.106 is narrower than section 552.111 in that it applies specifically to the legislative process. *Id.*

You argue some of the remaining information is protected by section 552.106 of the Government Code. Upon review, we find you failed to demonstrate the information at issue constitutes recommendations, opinions, or advice for purposes of section 552.106. We therefore conclude the city may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.106 of the Government Code.

Section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information concerning an investigation that concluded in a result other than conviction or deferred adjudication. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(2). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(2) must demonstrate the information at issue relates to a criminal investigation

that has concluded in a final result other than conviction or deferred adjudication. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(2), .301(e)(1)(A). You state the information you indicated “are records dealing with the investigation of the crime for which there has been neither a conviction nor deferred.” However, section 552.108(a)(2) is applicable only if the information at issue is related to a concluded criminal case that “*did not* result in conviction or deferred adjudication.” (emphasis added). *Id.* § 552.108(a)(2). Thus, we find you failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.108(a)(2) to the information at issue. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code.

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the current and former home addresses and telephone numbers, emergency contact information, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former employees or officials of a governmental body who request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code.⁴ *Id.* § 552.117(a)(1). We note section 552.117 is also applicable to personal cellular telephone numbers, provided the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-6 (1988) (section 552.117 is not applicable to cellular telephone numbers paid for by governmental body and intended for official use). Whether a particular item of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time of the governmental body’s receipt of the request for the information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Thus, information may be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) only on behalf of a current or former employee or official who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date of the governmental body’s receipt of the request for the information. Information may not be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee or official who did not timely request under section 552.024 the information be kept confidential. Therefore, to the extent the individuals at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the city may only withhold the marked cellular telephone numbers if the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. Conversely, to the extent the employees at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024, the city may not withhold the marked information under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code 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

⁴The 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).

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 officials or employees. Thus, we rule conditionally. To the extent the e-mail addresses within the remaining information are the personal e-mail addresses of city officials or 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 officials or employees and subsection (c) does not apply, this information is subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code 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 may withhold the information you marked under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code. The city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. To the extent the individuals at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the city may only withhold the marked cellular telephone numbers if the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. To the extent the e-mail addresses within the remaining information are not the personal e-mail addresses of city officials or employees and subsection (c) does not apply, the city must withhold this information 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,

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

Emily Kunst
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

EK/gw

Ref: ID# 776565

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)