



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 20, 2022

Ms. Lizet Islas
City Attorney
City of Houston
P.O. Box 368
Houston, Texas 77001-0368

OR2022-39744

Dear Ms. Islas:

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# 990985 (GovQA Q081464).

The City of Houston (the "city") received a request for e-mails sent between named individuals including specified key words during a stated time period.¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.105, 552.106, 552.111, and 552.1331 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

Section 552.1331 of the Government Code provides, in part:

(a) In this section:

¹We 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). Further, you inform us the city sent the requestor an estimate of charges pursuant to section 552.2615 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.2615. The estimate of charges required the requestor to provide a deposit for payment of anticipated costs under section 552.263 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.263(a). You also inform us the city received the required deposit on September 22, 2022. *See id.* § 552.263(e) (if governmental body requires deposit or bond for anticipated costs pursuant to section 552.263, request for information is considered to have been received on date governmental body receives bond or deposit).

² We assume that the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

(1) “Advanced metering system” means a utility metering system that collects data at regular intervals through the use of an automated wireless or radio network.

(2) “Government-operated utility” has the meaning assigned by Section 182.051, Utilities Code.

(b) Except as provided by Subsection (c) of this section and Section 182.052, Utilities Code, information maintained by a government-operated utility is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if it is information that:

(1) is collected as part of an advanced metering system for usage, services, and billing, including amounts billed or collected for utility usage; or

(2) reveals whether:

(A) an account is delinquent or eligible for disconnection; or

(B) services have been discontinued by the government-operated utility.

Gov’t Code § 552.1331(a)–(b). We understand the city is a government-operated utility for purposes of section 552.1331. *See* Util. Code § 182.051(3) (providing a “government-operated utility” is a governmental body or entity that, for compensation, provides water, wastewater, sewer, gas, garbage, electricity, or drainage service). The city contends the submitted information is protected under section 552.1331 of the Government Code. However, upon review, we conclude the city has failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.1331 of the Government Code to the submitted information and thus, may not withhold it on that basis.

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. This section encompasses information made confidential by other statutes, such as section 182.052 of the Utilities Code, which provides, in relevant part:

(a) Except as provided by Section 182.054, a government-operated utility may not disclose personal information in a customer’s account record, or any information relating to the volume or units of utility usage or the amounts billed to or collected from the individual for utility usage, unless the customer requests that the government-operated utility disclose keep the information confidential.

(b) A customer may request disclosure of information described by Subsection (a) by delivering to the government-operated utility an

appropriately marked form provided under Subsection (c)(2) or any other written request for disclosure.

Util. Code § 182.052(a)-(b). “Personal information” under section 182.052(a) includes an individual’s address, but does not include the individual’s name. *See id.* § 182.051(4); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 625 (1994) (construing statutory predecessor). Waste, wastewater, gas, garbage, electricity, and drainage services are included in the scope of utility services covered by section 182.052. *See* Util. Code § 182.051(3). Section 182.054 of the Utilities Code provides six exceptions to the disclosure prohibition found in section 182.052. *See id.* § 182.054. We note because section 182.052 is intended to protect the safety and privacy of individual customers, this statute is applicable only to information pertaining to natural persons, and does not protect information relating to business, governmental, and other artificial entities. *See* ORD 625 at 4-5 (in context of section 182.051(4) of the Utility Code, “individual” means only natural persons and does not include artificial entities). Water services are included in the scope of utility services covered by section 182.052. *See* Util. Code § 182.051(3). Section 182.054 of the Utilities Code provides six exceptions to the disclosure prohibition found in section 182.052. *See id.* § 182.054.

We understand the city’s water utility is a government-operated utility for purposes of section 182.052. *See id.* § 182.051(3). The city argues the information it marked is subject to section 182.052(a) of the Utilities Code. Upon review, we are unable to discern which portions of the submitted information relate to business, governmental, or other artificial entities. Accordingly, we must rule conditionally. To the extent the information we have marked does not relate to business, governmental, or other artificial entities and the customers did not request that the city disclose information described by subsection (a) of section 182.052, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 182.052(a) of the Utilities Code.³ Conversely, to the extent any portion of the information at issue relates to business, governmental, or other artificial entities, or the customers requested that the city disclose information described by subsection (a) of section 182.052, the city may not withhold such information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis, but must release it. In either case, we find the remaining information at issue does not constitute personal information of a customer or the volume or units of utility usage and the amounts billed to or collected for that utility usage. Therefore, the remaining information is not confidential under section 182.052, and the city may not withhold it under section 552.101 on that basis.

Section 552.105 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information relating to:

- (1) the location of real or personal property for a public purpose prior to public announcement of the project; or
- (2) appraisals or purchase price of real or personal property for a public purpose prior to the formal award of contracts for the property.

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

Gov't Code § 552.105. We note this provision is designed to protect a governmental body's planning and negotiating position with regard to particular transactions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 564 (1990), 357 (1982), 310 (1982). Information that is excepted from disclosure under section 552.105 that pertains to such negotiations may be excepted from disclosure so long as the transaction relating to that information is not complete. *See* ORD 310. Under section 552.105, a governmental body may withhold information "which, if released, would impair or tend to impair [its] 'planning and negotiating position in regard to particular transactions.'" ORD 357 at 3 (quoting Open Records Decision No. 222 (1979)). The question of whether specific information, if publicly released, would impair a governmental body's planning and negotiating position with regard to particular transactions is a question of fact. Accordingly, this office will accept a governmental body's good-faith determination in this regard, unless the contrary is clearly shown as a matter of law. *See* ORD 564.

You state the information you marked relates to a pending real estate transaction and disclosing that information would adversely affect negotiations in the pending real estate transaction. You state release of the information you marked would effect the purchase price of the property and reveal the location of certain property. You state there have been no award of contracts for the properties. Based on your representations and our review, we find section 552.105 is applicable in this instance. Accordingly, we conclude the city may withhold the information it marked pursuant to section 552.105 of the Government Code.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. *See* Gov't Code § 552.107(1). When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body has the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate the information constitutes or documents a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made "to facilitate the rendition of professional legal services" to the client governmental body. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). The privilege does not apply when an attorney or representative is involved in some capacity other than that of providing or facilitating professional legal services to the client governmental body. *In re Tex. Farmers Ins. Exch.*, 990 S.W.2d 337, 340 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1999, orig. proceeding) (attorney-client privilege does not apply if attorney acting in capacity other than that of attorney). Governmental attorneys often act in capacities other than that of professional legal counsel, such as administrators, investigators, or managers. Thus, the mere fact that a communication involves an attorney for the government does not demonstrate this element. Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). Thus, a governmental body must inform this office of the identities and capacities of the individuals to whom each communication at issue has been made. Lastly, the attorney-client privilege applies only to a *confidential* communication, *id.*, meaning it was "not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those: (A) to whom disclosure is made to further the rendition of professional legal services to the client; or (B) reasonably necessary to transmit the communication." *Id.* 503(a)(5). Whether a communication meets this definition depends on the *intent* of the parties involved at the time the information was communicated. *See Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997,

orig. proceeding). Moreover, because the client may elect to waive the privilege at any time, a governmental body must explain the confidentiality of a communication has been maintained. Section 552.107(1) generally excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege unless otherwise waived by the governmental body. *See Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein).

The city states some of the remaining information consists of communications between city attorneys and attorney representatives and city employees in their capacities as clients. The city explains these communications were made for the purpose of providing professional legal services to the city. The city states these communications were confidential, and you do not indicate the city has waived the confidentiality of the information at issue. Based upon these representations and our review, we find the city has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Thus, the city may withhold the information it marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

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*. 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, 364 (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)*.

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. v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.); *see 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 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.

You state some of the remaining information consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations of city employees regarding policymaking matters. We understand the draft documents at issue were intended to be released in their final forms. Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we find you have demonstrated the information at issue, which we have 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. However, we find the remaining information at issue consists of information that is administrative or purely factual in nature, does not pertain to policymaking, or was shared with a party with whom the city has not demonstrated it shares a privity of interest or common deliberative process. Thus, you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information reveals advice, opinions, or recommendations that pertain to policymaking. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.111 of the Government Code on the basis of the deliberative process privilege.

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. Because "the right of privacy is purely personal[.]" that right "terminates upon the death of the person whose privacy is invaded[.]" *Moore v. Charles B. Pierce Film Enters., Inc.*, 589 S.W.2d 489, 491 (Tex. Civ. App.—Texarkana 1979, writ ref'd n.r.e.); *see also Justice v. Belo Broad. Corp.*, 472 F. Supp. 145, 147 (N.D. Tex. 1979) ("action for invasion of privacy can be maintained only by a living individual whose privacy is invaded" (quoting RESTATEMENT (SECOND) OF TORTS § 6521)); Attorney General Opinions JM-229 (1984) ("the right of privacy lapses upon death"), H-917 (1976) ("We are . . . of the opinion that the Texas courts would follow the almost uniform rule of other jurisdictions that the right of privacy lapses upon death."); Open Records Decision No. 272 (1981) ("the right of privacy is personal and lapses upon death"). 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.). Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). This office also 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. 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). Upon review, we find some of the remaining information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find the city has not demonstrated any of the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code exempts from disclosure the home address and telephone number, emergency contact information, social security number, and family member information of a current or former employee or official of a governmental body who requests this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code.⁴ *See* Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). Additionally, section 552.117 is 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 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. Accordingly, to the extent the individuals whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the city must withhold the information we indicated under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the cellular telephone numbers at issue may be withheld only if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service.

Section 552.136 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.” Gov't Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). Accordingly, the city must withhold the utility account numbers within the remaining information under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

⁴ The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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). *See id.* § 552.137(a)-(c). Section 552.137 is not applicable to an institutional e-mail address, an Internet website 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 maintained by a governmental entity for one of its officials or employees, or a personal e-mail address belonging to a city employee or official used to conduct official government business. *See id.* § 552.137(c); *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)). Accordingly, to the extent the e-mail addresses within the remaining information belong to members of the public and are not excluded by subsection 552.137(c) of the Government Code, the city must withhold such e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the individuals to whom the e-mail addresses belong affirmatively consent to their release. *See id.* § 552.137(b). However, to the extent an e-mail address within the remaining responsive information at issue is excluded by subsection 552.137(c) or belongs to a city employee or official, the city may not withhold that e-mail address under section 552.137 of the Government Code.

In summary, to the extent the customers whose information is at issue are natural persons who did not request that the city disclose information described by subsection (a) of section 182.052, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 182.052(a) of the Utilities Code. The city may withhold the information it marked pursuant to section 552.105 of the Government Code. The city may withhold the information it marked under section 552.107(1) 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 have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. To the extent the individuals whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the city must withhold the information we indicated under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the cellular telephone numbers at issue may be withheld only if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service. The city must withhold the utility account numbers within the remaining information under section 552.136 of the Government Code. To the extent the e-mail addresses within the remaining information belong to members of the public and are not excluded by subsection 552.137(c) of the Government Code, the city must withhold such e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the individuals to whom the e-mail addresses belong 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 <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,

Erin Groff
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

EMG/pt

Ref: ID# 990985

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)