



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

July 1, 2014

Ms. Heather Silver
Mr. Michael Bostic
Assistant City Attorneys
City of Dallas
1500 Marilla Street, Room 7DN
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2014-11222

Dear Ms. Silver & Mr. Bostic:

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# 527510.

The City of Dallas (the "city") received a request for "the NRP application for Singleton apartments . . . and the [related] power point presentation." You claim some of the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.137 of the Government Code. Additionally, you state release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of NRP Management, L.L.C.; NRP Contractors, L.L.C.; and Singleton Apartments, Ltd. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified these third parties of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information 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 considered the claimed exceptions and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

¹We assume 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 those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

We note an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received comments from any of the third parties explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude any third party has a protected proprietary interest in the submitted information. *See id.* § 552.110; Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the information at issue on the basis of any proprietary interest any third party may have in it.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 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 found that personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545 (1990). We note that common-law privacy protects the interests of individuals, not those of corporate and other business entities. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 620 (1993) (corporation has no right to privacy), 192 (1978) (right to privacy is designed primarily to protect human feelings and sensibilities, rather than property, business, or other pecuniary interests); *see also United States v. Morton Salt Co.*, 338 U.S. 632, 652 (1950) (cited in *Rosen v. Matthews Constr. Co.*, 777 S.W.2d 434 (Tex. App—Houston [14th Dist.] 1989), *rev'd on other grounds*, 796 S.W.2d 692 (Tex. 1990)) (corporation has no right to privacy).

Upon review, we find the information you seek to withhold pertains to corporate or business entities and does not pertain to an identified individual. Accordingly, the information at issue does not satisfy the standards articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the city may not withhold the information you have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.137 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). However, section 552.137 is not applicable to an e-mail address “provided to a governmental body by a vendor who seeks to contract with the governmental body or by the vendor’s agent” or “contained in a response to a request for bids or proposals, contained in a response to similar invitations soliciting offers or information relating to a potential contract, or provided to a governmental body in the course of negotiating the terms of a contract or potential contract[.]” *See id.* § 552.137(c)(2), (3). The e-mail addresses you seek to withhold are subject to section 552.137(c). Therefore, the city may not withhold the e-mail addresses at issue under section 552.137 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.137(a). As you raise no further exceptions to disclosure, the city must release the submitted 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,



Cindy Nettles
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CN/dls

Ref: ID# 527510

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

NRP Management, L.L.C.
5309 Transportation Boulevard
Cleveland, Ohio 44125
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Brett McMahon
Senior Vice President-Construction
NRP Contractors, L.L.C.
200 Concord Plaza, Suite 900
San Antonio, Texas 78216
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Daniel B. Markson
Singleton Apartments, Ltd.
200 Concord Plaza, Suite 900
San Antonio, Texas 78216
(w/o enclosures)