



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

January 21, 2010

Ms. Priscilla Rodriguez
Executive Director
Brownsville Historical Association
Brownsville Heritage Complex
1325 East Washington Street
Brownsville, Texas 78520

OR2010-00962

Dear Ms. 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# 367618.

The Brownsville Historical Association (the "association") received a request for the most recent and current roster of names, addresses, and telephone numbers of the entire membership of the association. The association asserts it is not a governmental body subject to the Act. In the alternative, you claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.104 of the Government Code. We also understand you to raise section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered your arguments.

The Act requires a governmental body to make information that is within its possession or control available to the public, with certain statutory exceptions. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.002(a), .006, .021. Under the Act, the term "governmental body" includes several enumerated kinds of entities and "the part, section, or portion of an organization, corporation, commission, committee, institution, or agency that spends or that is supported in whole or in part by public funds[.]" *Id.* §.552.003(1)(A)(xii). "Public funds" means funds of the state or of a governmental subdivision of the state. *Id.* § 552.003(5).

Both the courts and this office previously have considered the scope of the definition of "governmental body" under the Act and its statutory predecessor. In *Kneeland v. Nat'l*

Collegiate Athletic Ass'n, 850 F.2d 224 (5th Cir. 1988), *cert. denied*, 488 U.S. 1042 (1989), the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit recognized that opinions of this office do not declare private persons or businesses to be “governmental bodies” that are subject to the Act “simply because [the persons or businesses] provide specific goods or services under a contract with a government body.” *Kneeland*, 850 F.2d at 228 (quoting Open Records Decision No. 1 (1973)). Rather, the *Kneeland* court noted that in interpreting the predecessor to section 552.003 of the Government Code, this office’s opinions generally examine the facts of the relationship between the private entity and the governmental body and apply three distinct patterns of analysis:

The opinions advise that an entity receiving public funds becomes a governmental body under the Act, unless its relationship with the government imposes “a specific and definite obligation . . . to provide a measurable amount of service in exchange for a certain amount of money as would be expected in a typical arms-length contract for services between a vendor and purchaser.” Tex. Att’y Gen. No. JM-821 (1987), quoting ORD-228 (1979). That same opinion informs that “a contract or relationship that involves public funds and that indicates a common purpose or objective or that creates an agency-type relationship between a private entity and a public entity will bring the private entity within the . . . definition of a ‘governmental body.’” Finally, that opinion, citing others, advises that some entities, such as volunteer fire departments, will be considered governmental bodies if they provide “services traditionally provided by governmental bodies.”

Id. The *Kneeland* court ultimately concluded that the National Collegiate Athletic Association (the “NCAA”) and the Southwest Conference (the “SWC”), both of which received public funds, were not “governmental bodies” for purposes of the Act, because both provided specific, measurable services in return for those funds. *Id.* at 230-31.

Both the NCAA and the SWC were associations made up of both private and public universities. The NCAA and the SWC both received dues and other revenues from their member institutions. *Id.* at 226-28. In return for those funds, the NCAA and the SWC provided specific services to their members, such as supporting various NCAA and SWC committees; producing publications, television messages, and statistics; and investigating complaints of violations of NCAA and SWC rules and regulations. *Id.* at 229-31. The *Kneeland* court concluded that although the NCAA and the SWC received public funds from some of their members, neither entity was a “governmental body” for purposes of the Act, because the NCAA and SWC did not receive the funds for their general support. Rather, the NCAA and the SWC provided “specific and gaugeable services” in return for the funds that they received from their member public institutions. *See id.* at 231; *see also A.H. Belo Corp. v. S. Methodist Univ.*, 734 S.W.2d 720 (Tex. App. – Dallas 1987, writ denied) (athletic departments of private-school members of Southwest Conference did not receive or spend public funds and thus were not governmental bodies for purposes of Act).

In exploring the scope of the definition of "governmental body" under the Act, this office has distinguished between private entities that receive public funds in return for specific, measurable services and those entities that receive public funds as general support. In Open Records Decision No. 228 (1979), we considered whether the North Texas Commission (the "commission"), a private, nonprofit corporation chartered for the purpose of promoting the interests of the Dallas-Fort Worth metropolitan area, was a governmental body. *Id.* at 1. The commission's contract with the City of Fort Worth obligated the city to pay the commission \$80,000 per year for three years. *Id.* The contract obligated the commission, among other things, to "[c]ontinue its current successful programs and implement such new and innovative programs as will further its corporate objectives and common City's interests and activities." *Id.* at 2. Noting this provision, this office stated that "[e]ven if all other parts of the contract were found to represent a strictly arms-length transaction, we believe that this provision places the various governmental bodies which have entered into the contract in the position of 'supporting' the operation of the Commission with public funds within the meaning of section 2(1)(F)." *Id.* Accordingly, the commission was determined to be a governmental body for purposes of the Act. *Id.*

In Open Records Decision No. 602 (1992), we addressed the status under the Act of the Dallas Museum of Art (the "DMA"). The DMA was a private, nonprofit corporation that had contracted with the City of Dallas to care for and preserve an art collection owned by the city and to maintain, operate, and manage an art museum. *Id.* at 1-2. The contract required the city to support the DMA by maintaining the museum building, paying for utility service, and providing funds for other costs of operating the museum. *Id.* at 2. We noted that an entity that receives public funds is a governmental body under the Act, unless the entity's relationship with the governmental body from which it receives funds imposes "a specific and definite obligation . . . to provide a measurable amount of service in exchange for a certain amount of money as would be expected in a typical arms-length contract for services between a vendor and purchaser." *Id.* at 4. We found that "the [City of Dallas] is receiving valuable services in exchange for its obligations, but, in our opinion, the very nature of the services the DMA provides to the [City of Dallas] cannot be known, specific, or measurable." *Id.* at 5. Thus, we concluded that the City of Dallas provided general support to the DMA facilities and operation, making the DMA a governmental body to the extent that it received the city's financial support. *Id.* Therefore, the DMA's records that related to programs supported by public funds were subject to the Act. *Id.*

We additionally note that the precise manner of public funding is not the sole dispositive issue in determining whether a particular entity is subject to the Act. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-821 at 3 (1987). Other aspects of a contract or relationship that involves the transfer of public funds between a private and a public entity must be considered in determining whether the private entity is a "governmental body" under the Act. *Id.* at 4. For example, a contract or relationship that involves public funds, and that indicates a common purpose or objective or that creates an agency-type relationship between a private entity and a public entity, will bring the private entity within the definition of a "governmental body"

under section 552.003(1)(A)(xii) of the Government Code. The overall nature of the relationship created by the contract is relevant in determining whether the private entity is so closely associated with the governmental body that the private entity falls within the Act. *Id.*

In the present case, we understand the association is a nonprofit corporation that has contracted with the City of Brownsville (the "city") to receive a portion of the city's hotel/motel tax to defray the association's cost of providing services for the city and its residents. The revenue from the hotel/motel tax is used to promote tourism and the convention and hotel industry and may only be used for the purposes listed in section 351.101 of the Texas Tax Code. After reviewing the contract and the applicable law, we conclude that the city and the association share a common purpose and objective such that an agency-type relationship is created. *See* Open Records Decision No. 621 (1993) at 9; *see also* Local Gov't Code § 380.001(a), (b) (providing that governing body of municipality may establish and provide for administration of one or more programs, including programs for making loans and grants of money and providing personnel and services of the municipality, to promote state or local development and to stimulate business and commercial activity on the municipality). Further, we find the services that the association provides to the city in exchange for the hotel/motel tax revenue constitute traditional governmental functions. *See* ORD 621 at 8 n.10. Accordingly, we conclude that the association falls within the definition of a "governmental body" under section 552.003(1)(A)(xii) of the Government Code to the extent it is supported by city funds.

We note, however, that an organization is not necessarily a "governmental body" in its entirety. "The part, section, or portion of an organization, corporation, commission, committee, institution, or agency that spends or that is supported in whole or in part by public funds" is a governmental body. Gov't Code § 552.003(1)(A)(xii); *see also* ORD 602 (only the records of those portions of the Dallas Museum of Art that were directly supported by public funds are subject to the Act). Accordingly, only those records relating to those parts of the association's operations that are directly supported by public funds are subject to disclosure requirements of the Act.


In this instance, the requested information consists of the recent and current roster of names, addresses, and telephone numbers of the entire membership of the association. You state that the membership roster is a list of private individuals and families who are paying for a service from the association. You state the membership dues are a stream of private income for the association. You further state that the membership service is a self-sustaining function of the association and does not use public monies for its maintenance. Thus, you inform us that the "membership roster does not fall within the 'part, section, or portion of an organization, corporation, commission, committee, institution, or agency that spends or that

is supported in whole or in part by public funds.” Therefore, we conclude that the requested information is not public information subject to disclosure under the Act.¹

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.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php, 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 must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General, toll free at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Andrea L. Caldwell
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

ALC/eeg

Ref: ID# 367618

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

¹As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure.