



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 3, 2020

Mr. Ray Rodriguez
Deputy City Attorney
City of San Antonio
P.O. Box 839966
San Antonio, Texas 78283-3966

OR2020-15316

Dear Mr. Rodriguez:

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# 831492 (COSA File# W310432-031220).

The City of San Antonio (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified agreement under chapter 380 of the Local Government Code.¹ You state the city has released some information. You claim the submitted information is not subject to the Act, or alternatively is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. Additionally, you state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of Pentagon Federal Credit Union ("PenFed"). Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified PenFed of the request for information and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information at issue should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in the Act in certain circumstances). We have received comments from PenFed. We have also received and considered comments from the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should or should not be released). We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

¹ We note the city sought and received clarification of the information requested. *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 when governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification of unclear or overbroad request for public information, ten-business-day period to request attorney general opinion is measured from date request is clarified or narrowed).

Initially, the city argues the submitted information is not subject to the Act. The Act applies to “public information,” which is defined in section 552.002 of the Government Code as:

(a) . . . information that is written, produced, collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business:

(1) by a governmental body; or

(2) for a governmental body and the governmental body:

(A) owns the information;

(B) has a right of access to the information; or

(C) spends or contributes public money for the purpose of writing, producing, collecting, assembling, or maintaining the information; or

(3) by an individual officer or employee of a governmental body in the officer’s or employee’s official capacity and the information pertains to official business of the governmental body.

Id. § 552.002(a). Thus, virtually all of the information in a governmental body’s physical possession constitutes public information and thus is subject to the Act. *Id.* § 552.002(a)(1); *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 549 at 4 (1990), 514 at 1-2 (1988). The Act also encompasses information that a governmental body does not physically possess. Information that is written, produced, collected, assembled, or maintained by a third party, including an individual officer or employee of a governmental body in his or her official capacity, may be subject to disclosure under the Act if a governmental body owns, has a right of access, or spends or contributes public money for the purpose of writing, producing, collecting, assembling, or maintaining the information. Gov’t Code § 552.002(a); *see* Open Records Decision No. 462 at 4 (1987). Information is “in connection with the transaction of official business” if the information is created by, transmitted to, received by, or maintained by a person or entity performing official business or a government function on behalf of a governmental body and the information pertains to official business of the governmental body. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.002(a-1). Moreover, section 552.001 of the Act provides that it is the policy of this state that each person is entitled, unless otherwise expressly provided by law, at all times to complete information about the affairs of government and the official acts of public officials and employees. *See id.* § 552.001(a).

The city argues the submitted information is not “public information” subject to the Act because PenFed, who provided the submitted information, is not a governmental body subject to the Act. *See id.* § 552.003(1)(A) (defining “governmental body” for purposes of the Act). However, we note the submitted information is in the possession of the city, the city has submitted the information at issue as responsive to the instant request for

information, and the submitted information relates to an agreement between the city and PenFed. Accordingly, we find the city maintains this information in connection with the transaction of its official business. Thus, the submitted information constitutes public information subject to the Act and may only be withheld if an exception to disclosure under the Act applies.

Next, we note the city has redacted some of the submitted information. Pursuant to section 552.301 of the Government Code, a governmental body that seeks to withhold requested information must submit to this office a copy of the information, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the copy, unless the governmental body has received a previous determination for the information at issue or has statutory authorization to withhold the information without requesting a decision under the Act. *See id.* § 552.301(a), (e)(1)(D). The city does not assert, nor does our review of our records indicate, the city is authorized to withhold this information without first seeking a ruling from this office. *See id.* § 552.301(a); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2000) (previous determinations). Therefore, this type of information must be submitted in a manner that enables this office to determine whether it falls within the scope of an exception to disclosure. However, because we can discern the nature of the redacted information, being deprived of the information does not inhibit our ability to make a ruling. Nonetheless, in the future, the city must not redact information from the information it submits to this office unless it is authorized to do so by statute or the information is the subject of a previous determination under section 552.301 of the Government Code. Failure to comply with section 552.301 may result in the information being presumed public under section 552.302 of the Government Code. *See Gov't Code* § 552.302.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” *Id.* § 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 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 also 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) (personal financial information includes choice of particular insurance carrier), 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). Whether the public’s interest in obtaining personal financial information is sufficient to justify its disclosure must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See* ORD 373. 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 we have indicated satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.² However, the city and PenFed have failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Thus, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

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).³ *See* 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). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the personal e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner affirmatively consents to its public disclosure.⁴

Next, PenFed asserts its information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.112 of the Government Code. However, section 552.112 is a discretionary exception that protects only the interests of a governmental body, as distinguished from exceptions that are intended to protect the interests of third parties. *See Birnbaum v. Alliance of Am. Insurers*, 994 S.W.2d 766, 776 (Tex. App.—Austin 1999, pet. denied) (section 552.112 is permissive exception that governmental body may waive in its discretion); Open Records Decision No. 522 (1989) (discretionary exceptions in general). The city did not assert section 552.112. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the information at issue pursuant to section 552.112.

PenFed generally asserts section 552.1101 of the Government Code. Section 552.1101(a) excepts from disclosure “information *submitted to a governmental body* by a vendor, contractor, potential vendor, or potential contractor *in response to a request for a bid, proposal, or qualification[.]*” Gov’t Code § 552.1101(a) (emphasis added). Additionally, we note section 552.1101(b) lists certain types of information to which section 552.1101(a) does not apply. *See id.* § 552.1101(b). Upon review, we find PenFed has failed to

² As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address PenFed’s arguments against disclosure of this information.

³ The 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).

⁴ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address PenFed’s arguments against disclosure of this information.

demonstrate the applicability of section 552.1101(a) to its information. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.1101(a).

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the personal e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner affirmatively consents to its public disclosure. 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 <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open-government/members-public/what-expect-after-ruling-issued> or call the OAG's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Public Information Act may be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the OAG, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

Kelly McWethy
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KM/jlbm

Ref: ID# 831492

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 2 Requestors
(w/o enclosures)