



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 6, 2016

Ms. Aimee Alcorn-Reed
Assistant City Attorney
City of Corpus Chwristi
P.O. Box 9277
Corpus Christi, Texas 78469-9277

OR2016-07746

Dear Ms. Alcorn-Reed:

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# 604669 (Corpus Christi File No. 038).

The City of Corpus Christi (the "city") received a request for any written communications between Slavin Management Consultants ("Slavin") and any city employee or official related to the search for a police chief including any attachments. You state the city will make some information available to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.110, and 552.111 of the Government Code. Additionally, you state release of some the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of Slavin. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified Slavin of the request for information and of Slavin's 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 submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Although you raise section 552.110 of the Government Code for the submitted information, that exception is designed to protect the interests of third parties, not the interests of a governmental body. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110 (excepts from disclosure trade secret or commercial or financial information obtained from third party). Thus, we do not address

your argument under section 552.110. We further 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) of the Government Code to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See id.* § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received comments from Slavin explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude Slavin has a protected proprietary interest in any of 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 submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest Slavin may have in the 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[.]” 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 (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).

Section 552.111 can also encompass communications between a governmental body and a third party, including a consultant or other party, with which the governmental body establishes it has a privity of interest or common deliberative process. *See* Open Records Decision No. 561 at 9 (1990) (section 552.111 encompasses communications with party with which governmental body has privity of interest or common deliberative process). 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. We note a governmental body does not have a privity of interest or common deliberative process with a private party with which the governmental body is engaged in contract negotiations. *See id.* (section 552.111 not applicable to communication with entity with which governmental body has no privity of interest or common deliberative process).

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 (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 Exhibit C consists of communications between city employees and a third-party consultant with whom the district shares privity of interest. You further state the communications encompass policymaking recommendations and directives. We note the information at issue contains draft documents, and you indicate the draft documents were intended to be released in their final forms. Based on your representations and our review, we find the city may withhold the information we have marked in Exhibit C under section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, because the city and third-party consultant were negotiating a contract at the time of some of the remaining communications, their interests were adverse at the time the communications were made. Thus, we find you have failed to establish the city shared a privity of interest with the third-party consultant with respect to these communications. Additionally, we find some of the remaining information is general administrative and purely factual information, or does not pertain to policymaking. Therefore, we find you have failed to demonstrate how the remaining information at issue consists of advice, opinions, or recommendations regarding

policymaking matters. Consequently, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

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[.]”¹ 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 of city employees, which we have marked, under section 552.102(a) 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.” 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. Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Thus, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure the home address, home telephone number, emergency contact information, and social security number of a peace officer, as well as information that reveals whether the peace officer has family members, regardless of whether the peace officer complies with sections 552.024 and 552.1175 of the Government Code. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.117(a)(2). Section 552.117 also protects a peace officer’s personal cellular telephone number if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service. *See* Open Records Decision No. 670 at 6 (2001) (section 552.117(a)(2) excepts from disclosure peace officer’s cellular telephone or pager number if officer pays for cellular telephone or pager service). Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code. However, the city may not withhold the cellular telephone numbers at issue under section 552.117(a)(2) if a governmental body pays for the cellular telephone service.

¹The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

Section 552.1175 of the Government Code protects the home address, home telephone number, emergency contact information, date of birth, social security number, and family member information of certain individuals when that information is held by a governmental body in a non-employment capacity and the individual elects to keep the information confidential. Gov't Code § 552.1175(b). Section 552.1175(b) also encompasses a personal cellular telephone number, unless the cellular service is paid for by a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-7 (1988) (statutory predecessor to section 552.117 not applicable to cellular telephone numbers provided and paid for by governmental body and intended for official use). Section 552.1175 applies, in part, to “peace officers as defined by Article 2.12, Code of Criminal Procedure[.]” Gov't Code § 552.1175(a)(1). Thus, to the extent the officers at issue elect to restrict access to their information in accordance with section 552.1175(b), then the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.1175 of the Government Code; however, the city may only withhold the marked cellular telephone numbers if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service. However, if the officers whose information we have marked do not elect to restrict access to their information in accordance with section 552.1175(b), then the city may not withhold this information under section 552.1175. In addition, to the extent the cellular telephone service is paid for by a governmental body, the marked cellular telephone numbers may not be withheld under section 552.1175.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's license, 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. *See id.* § 552.130(a). Therefore, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.136(b) 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.” *Id.* § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). This office has concluded insurance policy numbers constitute access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. Thus, the city must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city may withhold the information we have marked in Exhibit C under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the dates of birth of city employees, which we have marked, under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code; however, the city may not withhold the cellular telephone numbers at issue under section 552.117(a)(2) if a governmental body pays for the cellular telephone service. To the extent the officers at issue elect to restrict access to their information in accordance with section 552.1175(b), then the city must withhold the information we have

marked under section 552.1175 of the Government Code; however, the city may only withhold the marked cellular telephone numbers if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone 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 insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. 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 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,



Abigail T. Adams
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

ATA/akg

Ref: ID# 604669

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Robert E. Slavin
Slavin Management Consultants
3040 Holcomb Bridge Road, Suite A-1
Norcross, Georgia 30071
(w/o enclosures)