



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 8, 2016

Mr. Robert Blumenfeld  
Counsel for the El Paso Housing Authority  
Mendel Blumenfeld, PLLC  
5809 Acacia Circle  
El Paso, Texas 79912

OR2016-02963

Dear Mr. Blumenfeld:

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# 597452.

The Housing Authority of the City of El Paso (the "authority"), which you represent, received two requests from the same requestor for multiple categories of information pertaining to federal housing subsidies and correspondence with the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development ("HUD") regarding "over-income" families. The authority states it has released most of the requested information to the requestor. The authority claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.111, and 552.116 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions the authority claims and reviewed the submitted information.

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[.]" *Id.* § 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 (1993), 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 that 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 (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). Additionally, section 552.111 does not generally except from disclosure purely factual information that is severable from the opinion portions of internal memoranda. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.); ORD 615 at 4-5. 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.

We note section 552.111 can encompass communications between a governmental body and a third party. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 631 at 2 (Gov't Code § 552.111 encompasses information created for governmental body by outside consultant acting at governmental body's request and performing task that is within governmental body's authority), 561 at 9 (1990) (Gov't Code § 552.111 encompasses communications with party with which governmental body has privity of interest or common deliberative process), 462 at 14 (1987) (Gov't Code § 552.111 applies to memoranda prepared by governmental body's consultants). When determining if an interagency communication is excepted from disclosure under section 552.111, we must consider whether the entities between which the communication is passed share a privity of interest or common deliberative process with regard to the policy matter at issue. *See id.* In order 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* ORD 561 at 9.

The authority seeks to withhold the submitted correspondence between the authority and HUD under section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, the authority states, pursuant to federal law and funding agreements, HUD is the primary agency that oversees and monitor's the authority's use of federal public housing funds and compliance with federal public housing laws. Upon review, we find the authority has failed to demonstrate it shares a privity of interest or common deliberative process with HUD, which appears to be acting in a regulatory capacity. Therefore, we find the authority has failed to establish the applicability of section 552.111 to the information at issue. Accordingly, the submitted information may not be withheld under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Section 552.116 of the Government Code provides the following:

(a) An audit working paper of an audit of the state auditor or the auditor of a state agency, an institution of higher education as defined by Section 61.003, Education Code, a county, a municipality, a school district, a hospital district, or a joint board operating under Section 22.074, Transportation Code, including any audit relating to the criminal history background check of a public school employee, is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021. If information in an audit working paper is also maintained in another record, that other record is not excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 by this section.

(b) In this section:

(1) "Audit" means an audit authorized or required by a statute of this state or the United States, the charter or an ordinance of a municipality, an order of the commissioners court of a county, the bylaws adopted by or other action of the governing board of a hospital district, a resolution or other action of a board of trustees of a school district, including an audit by the district relating to the criminal history background check of a public school employee, or a resolution or other action of a joint board described by Subsection (a) and includes an investigation.

(2) "Audit working paper" includes all information, documentary or otherwise, prepared or maintained in conducting an audit or preparing an audit report, including:

(A) intra-agency and interagency communications; and

(B) drafts of the audit report or portions of those drafts.

Gov't Code § 552.116. The authority seeks to withhold the submitted information under section 552.116 of the Government Code. However, the purpose of section 552.116 is to protect the interests of the auditor, not the auditee. Here, HUD is the auditor, and the information at issue is maintained by the authority, the auditee. As the auditee, the authority may not assert section 552.116 to protect its own interests in withholding information from disclosure. We note this office has received no arguments from HUD seeking to withhold the information at issue under section 552.116 of the Government Code. Accordingly, none of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.116 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision” and encompasses information made confidential by statute. *Id.* § 552.101. This section encompasses information other statutes make confidential. The authority claims the submitted information is protected by the Privacy Act of 1974, section 552a of title 5 of the United States Code (“Federal Privacy Act”). Section 552a(b) of the Federal Privacy Act provides, “[n]o agency shall disclose any record which is contained in a system of records by any means of communication to any person, or to another agency, except pursuant to a written request by, or with the prior written consent of, the individual to whom the record pertains[.]” 5 U.S.C. § 552a(b). However, our office and the courts have stated the Federal Privacy Act applies only to federal agencies, and not to state or local agencies. *See St. Michael's Convalescent Hosp. v. State of California*, 643 F.2d 1369, 1373 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1981) (definition of agency under Privacy Act does not encompass state agencies or bodies); *Shields v. Shetler*, 682 F. Supp. 1172, 1176 (D. Colo. 1988) (Privacy Act does not apply to state agencies or bodies); Attorney General Opinion MW-95 at 2 (1979) (neither FOIA nor federal Privacy Act applies to records held by state or local governmental bodies in Texas). The courts have also opined that neither the receipt of federal funds nor limited oversight by a federal entity convert state or local governmental bodies into agencies covered by the Privacy Act. *See St. Michael's Convalescent Hosp.*, 643 F.2d at 1373-74; *see also United States v. Orleans*, 425 U.S. 807, 816 (1976) (federal regulations and contract provisions do not convert acts of local and state governmental bodies into federal governmental acts). Upon review of the authority's arguments, we find the authority has failed to demonstrate the Federal Privacy Act applies to the submitted information. Accordingly, the authority may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

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 highly intimate or embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. This office has found personal financial information relating only to an individual ordinarily satisfies the first requirement of the test for common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision No. 545 (1990) (mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history).

In Open Records Decision No. 373 (1983), this office determined financial information submitted by applicants for federally-funded housing rehabilitation loans and grants was “information deemed confidential” by a common-law right of privacy. The financial information at issue in Open Records Decision No. 373 included sources of income, salary, mortgage payments, assets, medical and utility bills, social security and veterans benefits, retirement and state assistance benefits, and credit history. Similarly, we thus conclude financial information relating to a public housing resident or an applicant for housing assistance satisfies the first requirement of common-law privacy, in that it constitutes highly intimate or embarrassing facts about the individual, such that its public disclosure would be highly objectionable to a person of ordinary sensibilities.

The second requirement of the common-law privacy test requires the information not be of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 668. While the public generally has some interest in knowing whether public funds expended for housing assistance are being given to qualified applicants, we believe ordinarily this interest will not be sufficient to justify the invasion of the applicant’s privacy that would result from disclosure of information concerning his or her financial status. *See* ORD 373 (although any record maintained by governmental body is arguably of legitimate public interest, if only relation of individual to governmental body is as applicant for housing rehabilitation grant, second requirement of common-law privacy test not met). In particular cases, a requestor may demonstrate the existence of a public interest that will overcome the second requirement of the common-law privacy test. However, whether there is a public interest in this information sufficient to justify its disclosure must be decided on a case-by-case basis. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 523 (1989), 373.

Open Records Decision Nos. 373 and 523 draw a distinction between the confidential “background financial information furnished to a public body about an individual” and “the basic facts regarding a particular financial transaction between the individual and the public body.” Open Records Decision Nos. 523, 385 (1983). Subsequent decisions of this office analyze questions about the confidentiality of background financial information consistently with Open Records Decision No. 373. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992) (personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and governmental body is protected), 545 (employee’s participation in deferred compensation plan private), 523, 481 (1987) (individual financial information concerning applicant for public employment is closed), 480 (1987) (names of students receiving loans and amounts received from Texas Guaranteed Student Loan Corporation are public); *see also*

Attorney General Opinions H-1070 (1977), H-15 (1973) (laws requiring financial disclosure by public officials and candidates for office do not invade their privacy rights). *But see* Open Records Decision No. 602 at 5 (1992) (records related to salaries of those employees for whom the city pays portion are subject to Act). We note, however, this office has concluded the names and present addresses of current or former residents of a public housing development are not protected from disclosure under the common-law right to privacy. *See* Open Records Decision No. 318 (1982). Likewise, the amounts paid by a housing authority on behalf of eligible tenants are not protected from disclosure under privacy interests. *See* Open Records Decision No. 268 (1981); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 9-10, 545, 489 (1987), 480.

Upon review, we find the authority has failed to demonstrate any of the submitted information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the information is not confidential under common-law privacy, and the authority may not withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that ground.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of constitutional privacy, which consists of two interrelated types of privacy: (1) the right to make certain kinds of decisions independently and (2) an individual's interest in avoiding disclosure of personal matters. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 at 4 (1987). The first type protects an individual's autonomy within "zones of privacy," which include matters related to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education. *Id.* The second type of constitutional privacy requires a balancing between the individual's privacy interests and the public's need to know information of public concern. *Id.* The scope of information protected is narrower than that under the common-law doctrine of privacy; the information must concern the "most intimate aspects of human affairs." *Id.* at 5 (citing *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Texas*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985)). Upon review, we find the authority has failed to demonstrate any of the submitted information falls within the zones of privacy or implicates an individual's privacy interests for purposes of constitutional privacy. Therefore, the authority may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with constitutional privacy. As the authority raises no further exceptions against disclosure, the submitted information must be released.

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,



Rahat Huq  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

RSH/som

Ref: ID# 597452

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)