



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 26, 2016

Mr. David T. Ritter
Counsel for the City of McKinney
Brown & Hofmeister, L.L.P.
740 East Campbell Road, Suite 800
Richardson, Texas 75081

OR2016-04692

Dear Mr. Ritter:

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# 599821 (ORR # 15-17731).

The City of McKinney (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for (1) e-mails and text messages sent between two named individuals and city council members; and (2) the number of any e-mails or text messages that cannot be released due to attorney-client privilege.¹ You claim some of the submitted information does not consist of public information subject to the Act. Further, you claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, 552.108, 552.111, 552.117, 552.130, 552.136, 552.139, and 552.147 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative samples of information.²

¹You inform us the requestor was required to make a deposit for payment of anticipated costs for the request under section 552.263 of the Government Code, which the city received on November 30, 2015. *See* Gov't Code § 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 that governmental body receives deposit or bond).

²We assume the "representative samples" 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.

Initially, we note the requestor asks the city to answer a question. The Act does not require a governmental body to answer factual questions, conduct legal research, or create new information in responding to a request. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 563 at 8 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990). However, a governmental body must make a good-faith effort to relate a request to any responsive information that is within its possession or control. Open Records Decision Nos. 561 at 8-9 (1990), 555 at 102. We assume the city has made a good-faith effort to do so.

Next, you argue some of the submitted information is not subject to the Act. The Act applies to “public information,” which is defined in section 552.002(a) of the Government Code as:

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.

Gov’t Code § 552.002(a). Information is “in connection with the transaction of official business” if it is “created by, transmitted to, received by, or maintained by an officer or employee of the governmental body in the officer’s or employee’s official capacity, or a person or entity performing official business or a government function on behalf of a governmental body, and pertains to official business of the governmental body.” *Id.* § 552.002(a-1). Thus, virtually all of the information in a governmental body’s physical possession constitutes public information and is subject to the Act. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 549 at 4 (1990), 514 at 1-2 (1988).

You inform us the information you have marked consists of e-mails and text messages that do not pertain to official business. You indicate the information is purely personal in nature and does not concern the business of the city. Thus, you argue the information at issue does

not constitute public information subject to the Act. Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue we find this information does not constitute “information that is written, produced, collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business” by or for the city. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.002. Therefore, we conclude the information you marked does not constitute public information for purposes of section 552.002 of the Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 635 at 7 (1995) (section 552.002 not applicable to personal information unrelated to official business and created or maintained by state employee involving *de minimis* use of state resources). Accordingly, the city is not required to release the information you have marked in response to the request for information.³

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. Section 552.101 encompasses information protected by other statutes, such as section 261.201 of the Family Code, which provides, in relevant part:

(a) [T]he following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under [the Act], and may be disclosed only for purposes consistent with this code and applicable federal or state law or under rules adopted by an investigating agency:

(1) a report of alleged or suspected abuse or neglect made under [chapter 261 of the Family Code] and the identity of the person making the report; and

(2) except as otherwise provided in this section, the files, reports, records, communications, audiotapes, videotapes, and working papers used or developed in an investigation under [chapter 261 of the Family Code] or in providing services as a result of an investigation.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a). You contend a portion of the information at issue was used or developed in an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse; thus, this information falls within the scope of section 261.201 of the Family Code. *See id.* §§ 101.003(a) (defining “child” for purposes of section 261.201 as person under 18 years of age who is not and has not been married or who has not had the disabilities of minority removed for general purposes), 261.001(1), (4) (defining “abuse” and “neglect” for purposes of chapter 261 of the Family Code). As the city does not indicate the city’s police department has adopted a rule that governs the release of this type of information, we assume no such regulation exists. Given that assumption, and based on our review, we determine the information at issue is confidential pursuant to section 261.201 of the Family Code. *See* Open Records Decision

³As we are able to make this determination, we need not address the your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

No. 440 at 2 (1986) (predecessor statute). Therefore, the city must withhold the information you have marked in its entirety under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code.⁴

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 58.007 of the Family Code. Juvenile law enforcement records relating to conduct that occurred on or after September 1, 1997, are confidential under section 58.007(c). Section 58.007 provides, in pertinent part, as follows:

(c) Except as provided by Subsection (d), law enforcement records and files concerning a child and information stored, by electronic means or otherwise, concerning the child from which a record or file could be generated may not be disclosed to the public and shall be:

(1) if maintained on paper or microfilm, kept separate from adult files and records;

(2) if maintained electronically in the same computer system as records or files relating to adults, be accessible under controls that are separate and distinct from controls to access electronic data concerning adults; and

(3) maintained on a local basis only and not sent to a central state or federal depository, except as provided by Subchapters B, D, and E.

Fam. Code § 58.007(c). For purposes of section 58.007(c), “child” means a person who is ten years of age or older and under seventeen years of age when the conduct occurred. *See id.* § 51.02(2). You assert portions of the remaining information are confidential under section 58.007(c). However, you have failed to demonstrate the information at issue depicts an individual who is ten years of age or older and under the age of seventeen as a suspect or offender of delinquent conduct or conduct indicating a need for supervision. *See id.* § 51.03(a)-(b) (defining “delinquent conduct” and “conduct indicating a need for supervision” for purposes of section 58.007). Therefore, the city may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.007 of the Family Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the informer’s privilege, which has long been recognized by Texas courts. *See Aguilar v. State*, 444 S.W.2d 935, 937 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969); *Hawthorne v. State*, 10 S.W.2d 724, 725 (Tex. Crim. App. 1928). The informer’s privilege protects from disclosure the identities of persons who report activities

⁴As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the city’s remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

over which the governmental body has criminal or quasi-criminal law-enforcement authority, provided the subject of the information does not already know the informer's identity. *See* Open Records Decision No. 208 at 1-2 (1978). The informer's privilege protects the identities of individuals who report violations of statutes to the police or similar law-enforcement agencies, as well as those who report violations of statutes with civil or criminal penalties to "administrative officials having a duty of inspection or of law enforcement within their particular spheres." Open Records Decision No. 279 at 1-2 (1981) (citing 8 John H. Wigmore, *Evidence in Trials at Common Law*, § 2374, at 767 (J. McNaughton rev. ed. 1961)). The report must be of a violation of a criminal or civil statute. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 582 at 2 (1990), 515 at 4 (1988).

You state the information you have marked reveals the identity of a complainant who reported possible violations of law that carry criminal penalties to the city. There is no indication the subject of the complaint knows the identity of the complainant. Based on your representations and our review, we conclude the information we have marked identifies the complainant; thus, the city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. However, upon review, we find the remaining information does not reveal the identity of an individual who reported a violation of crime. Thus, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information it has marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege.

Section 552.102(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy[.]"⁵ Gov't Code § 552.102(a). The Texas Supreme Court held section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the dates of birth we have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code.⁶

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*

⁵The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body. Open Records Decision No. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

⁶As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the city's remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

Foundation. *Id.* at 683. A compilation of an individual's criminal history is highly embarrassing information, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person. *Cf. U.S. Dep't of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749, 764 (1989) (when considering prong regarding individual's privacy interest, court recognized distinction between public records found in courthouse files and local police stations and compiled summary of information and noted that individual has significant privacy interest in compilation of one's criminal history). Furthermore, we find a compilation of a private citizen's criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public. We note, active warrant information or other information relating to one's current involvement in the criminal justice system does not constitute criminal history information for the purposes of section 552.101. *See* Gov't Code § 411.081(b) (police department allowed to disclose information pertaining to person's current involvement in the criminal justice system). 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). Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). Upon review, we find the information we have marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information you have marked is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Thus, the city may not withhold the remaining information you have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

You assert portions of the remaining information are subject to section 552.103 of the Government Code. Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides, in relevant part, as follows:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

...

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated

on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). The governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received the request for information and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, orig. proceeding); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). The governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a).

The question of whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). To demonstrate litigation is reasonably anticipated, the governmental body must furnish concrete evidence that litigation involving a specific matter is realistically contemplated and is more than mere conjecture. *Id.* Concrete evidence to support a claim that litigation is reasonably anticipated may include, for example, the governmental body's receipt of a letter containing a specific threat to sue the governmental body from an attorney for a potential opposing party.⁷ Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be "realistically contemplated"). In addition, this office has concluded litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney. *See* Open Records Decision No. 288 at 2 (1981). However, an individual publicly threatening to bring suit against a governmental body, but who does not actually take objective steps toward filing suit, is not concrete evidence that litigation is reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 331 at 1-2 (1982).

You argue portions of the remaining information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.103. You generally assert this information "relate[s] to matters where litigation was pending or reasonably excepted, for example, where an EEOC report had been filed, or where negotiations for resolution had already been entered into by the parties." However, you do not inform us, nor does the information reflect, that any objective steps have been taken towards initiating litigation. Further, although a pending EEOC complaint generally indicates that litigation is reasonably anticipated, in this instance, you have not submitted any arguments demonstrating this information relates to a specific EEOC claim actually filed against the city. Accordingly, we find the city has failed to establish that section 552.103 is

⁷ In addition, this office has concluded litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party took the following objective steps toward litigation: filed a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), *see* Open Records Decision No. 336 (1982); hired an attorney who made a demand for disputed payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, *see* Open Records Decision No. 346 (1982).

applicable to the information at issue. Therefore, no portion of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. 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. Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate that 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 a 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)(A), (B), (C), (D), (E). 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.* 503(b)(1), 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. *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 that 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).

You state some of the remaining information consists of communications involving city attorneys and city employees and officials. You state the communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the city and these communications have remained confidential. Upon review, we find the city has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information you have

marked. Thus, the city may withhold the information you marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.⁸

Section 552.108(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if: (1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(1). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(1) must reasonably explain how and why the release of the information at issue would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706, 710 (Tex. 1977). You state portions of the remaining information relate to pending criminal investigations. Upon review, we conclude the release of the information at issue would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See Houston Chronicle Publ’g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (court delineates law enforcement interests present in active cases), *writ ref’d n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Thus, section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable to the information at issue. Accordingly, the city may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.⁹

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*, 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 include administrative and personnel matters of broad scope that affect the governmental body’s policy mission. *See*

⁸As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the city’s remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

⁹As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the city’s remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

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. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152, 157 (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, section 552.111 protects the factual information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 313 at 3 (1982).

This office has also concluded section 552.111 exempts from disclosure a preliminary draft of a document intended for public release in its final form because the draft necessarily represents the drafter's advice, opinion, and recommendation with regard to the form and content of the final document. *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 of a preliminary draft of a policymaking document, including comments, underlining, deletions, and proofreading marks, that will be released to the public in its final form. *See id.* at 2.

You state portions of the remaining information consist of advice, opinions, and recommendations relating to the city's policymaking. You also state the information at issue contains draft documents. You do not state whether the draft documents will be released to the public in final form. Thus, to the extent the city will release the draft documents to the public in their final form, the city may withhold them in their entirety under section 552.111. To the extent the city will not release the draft documents to the public in their final form, the city may not withhold them in their entirety under section 552.111. We find the remaining information you have marked under section 552.111, consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations pertaining to a policymaking matter. Accordingly, the city may withhold the remaining information you have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts 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. *See* Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). We note a post office box number is not a "home address" for purposes of section 552.117(a). *See* Open Records Decision No. 622 at 4 (1994) (legislative history makes clear that purpose of Gov't Code § 552.117 is to protect public employees from being harassed at home). We also note section 552.117 is also 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. We agree most of the information you have marked, in addition to the information we have marked, are subject to section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. However, we note some of the information you have marked, which we have marked for release, is not subject to section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. Therefore, to the extent the individuals at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, except for the information we have marked for release, the city must withhold the information you have marked, and the additional information we have marked, under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code.¹⁰ However, the city may only withhold the marked cellular telephone numbers if a governmental body did not pay for the service. To the extent the individuals at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024, the city may not withhold the marked information under section 552.117(a)(1). However, none of the remaining information constitutes the home address and telephone number, emergency contact information, social security number, or family member information of a current or former official or employee of the city. Accordingly, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release. Gov't Code § 552.130(a). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. However, none of the remaining information consists of motor vehicle record information, and the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

You assert some of the remaining information is excepted under section 552.136 of the Government Code. Section 552.136(b) 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." *Id.* § 552.136(b). Section 552.136(a) defines "access device" as "a card, plate, code, account number, personal identification number, electronic serial number, mobile identification number, or other telecommunications service, equipment, or instrument identifier or means of account access that alone or in conjunction with another access device may be used to . . . obtain money, goods, services, or another thing of value [or] initiate a transfer of funds other than a transfer

¹⁰As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the city's remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

originated solely by paper instrument.” *Id.* § 552.136(a). You assert the information you have marked consists of a password that can be used to access protected information. Upon review, we find you have not explained how the password you have marked constitutes an access device that may be used to obtain money, goods, services, or another thing of value for purposes of section 552.136. Thus, the city may not withhold this information under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

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, or an e-mail address maintained by a governmental entity for one of its officials or employees. *See id.* § 552.137(c). The city must withhold the e-mail address, a representative sample of which we have marked, under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners of the e-mail addresses affirmatively consent to their release. However, to the extent the e-mail addresses at issue are excluded by subsection 552.137(c), they may not be withheld under section 552.137 of the Government Code.

Section 552.139 of the Government Code provides, in part:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information that relates to computer network security, to restricted information under Section 2059.055 [of the Government Code], or to the design, operation, or defense of a computer network.

(b) The following information is confidential:

(1) a computer network vulnerability report; [and]

(2) any other assessment of the extent to which data processing operations, a computer, a computer program, network, system, or system interface, or software of a governmental body or of a contractor of a governmental body is vulnerable to unauthorized access or harm, including an assessment of the extent to which the governmental body’s or contractor’s electronically stored information containing sensitive or critical information is vulnerable to alteration, damage, erasure, or inappropriate use[.]

Id. § 552.139(a), (b)(1)-(2). Section 2059.055 of the Government Code provides in part:

(b) Network security information is confidential under this section if the information is:

- (1) related to passwords, personal identification numbers, access codes, encryption, or other components of the security system of a state agency;
- (2) collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental entity to prevent, detect, or investigate criminal activity; or
- (3) related to an assessment, made by or for a governmental entity or maintained by a governmental entity, of the vulnerability of a network to criminal activity.

Id. § 2059.055(b). You assert some of the remaining information “relates to computer network security and its release would adversely affect the ability of the [c]ity to maintain data security.” However, upon review, we find you have not demonstrated any of the remaining information relates to computer network security, or to the design, operation, or defense of a computer network as contemplated in section 552.139(a). Further, we find you have failed to explain any of the information consists of a computer network vulnerability report or assessment as contemplated by section 552.139(b). Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.139 of the Government Code.

Section 552.147(a) of the Government Code excepts the social security number of a living individual from public disclosure. *Id.* § 552.147. Upon review, we find the city may withhold the social security numbers we have marked under section 552.147 of the Government Code. However, we find no portion of the remaining information you have marked under section 552.147 of the Government Code consists of the social security numbers of living individuals, and the city may not withhold any of the remaining information on that basis.

In summary, the city is not required to release the marked e-mails and text messages which are not subject to the Act in response to the request for information. The city must withhold the information you have marked in its entirety under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code. The city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer’s privilege. The city must withhold the dates of birth we have marked under section 552.102 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. The city may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The city may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. To the extent the city will release the draft documents to the public in their final form, the city may withhold them in their entireties under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The city may withhold

the remaining information you have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. To the extent the individuals at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, except for the information we have marked for release, the city must withhold the information you have marked, and the additional information we have marked, under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. However, the city may only withhold the marked cellular telephone numbers if a governmental body did not pay for the service. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the e-mail addresses, a representative sample of which we have marked, under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners of the e-mail addresses affirmatively consent to their release or they are subject to subsection 552.137(c) of the Government Code. The city may withhold the social security numbers we have marked under section 552.147 of the Government Code. The remaining 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,



Katelyn Blackburn-Rader
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KB-R/bw

Ref: ID# 599821

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)