



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

February 16, 2005

Mr. Brad Norton
Assistant City Attorney
City of Austin
P.O. Box 1546
Austin, Texas 78767-1546

OR2005-01416

Dear Mr. Norton:

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# 218760.

The City of Austin (the "city") received a request for (1) records regarding three specific former Parks Department employees, including complaints, evaluations, training history, and sexual misconduct investigations, (2) information regarding "the city's role in the CSR [Community Service Restitution] program at city parks," and (3) "[c]ommunications received from Travis County regarding allegations of sexual misconduct...involving CSR workers." You state that much of the requested information will be released to the requestor. You claim, however, that portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, 552.111, 552.117, 552.1175, 552.130, and 552.137 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

Initially, we note that certain information has been redacted from one of the submitted documents. Because we can discern the specific category of information that has been redacted, being deprived of this information does not inhibit our ability to make a ruling in

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

this instance. Nevertheless, be advised that a failure to provide this office with requested information generally deprives us of the ability to determine whether information may be withheld and leaves this office with no alternative other than ordering that the redacted information be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body must provide this office with copy of "specific information requested").

We now turn to your arguments and begin by addressing your assertion that portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common law privacy. Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This section encompasses the doctrine of common law privacy. Common law privacy protects information that is 1) highly intimate or embarrassing, such that its release would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and 2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976). The types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. *Id.* at 683.

In addition, this office has found that the following types of information are excepted from required public disclosure under common law privacy: personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545 (1990); some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps); and identities of victims of sexual abuse, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 440 (1986), 393 (1983), 339 (1982). We have reviewed the submitted records and marked information that the city must withhold under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common law privacy.

Section 552.101 also encompasses statutes that make criminal history record information ("CHRI") confidential. CHRI that is generated by the National Crime Information Center ("NCIC") or by the Texas Crime Information Center ("TCIC") is confidential. Title 28, part 20 of the Code of Federal Regulations governs the release of CHRI that states obtain from the federal government or other states. Open Records Decision No. 565 (1990). The federal regulations allow each state to follow its individual law with respect to CHRI it generates. *Id.* Section 411.083 of the Government Code deems confidential CHRI that the Department of Public Safety ("DPS") maintains, except that DPS may disseminate this information as provided in chapter 411, subchapter F of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 411.083.

Sections 411.083(b)(1) and 411.089(a) authorize a criminal justice agency to obtain CHRI; however, a criminal justice agency may not release CHRI except to another criminal justice

agency for a criminal justice purpose. *Id.* § 411.089(b)(1). Other entities specified in chapter 411 of the Government Code are entitled to obtain CHRI from DPS or another criminal justice agency; however, those entities may not release CHRI except as provided by chapter 411. *See generally id.* §§ 411.090 - .127. Thus, any CHRI generated by the federal government or another state may not be made available to the requestor except in accordance with federal regulations. *See* Open Records Decision No. 565 (1990). Furthermore, any CHRI obtained from DPS or any other criminal justice agency must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with Government Code chapter 411, subchapter F. Thus, to the extent the responsive information includes any CHRI generated by TCIC or NCIC, such information is excepted from required public disclosure by section 552.101 of the Government Code.

Next, we address your assertion of section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. Section 552.107(1) 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 “for the purpose of facilitating 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 Texas 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 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 to whom disclosure is made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client or those reasonably necessary for the transmission of 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, no writ). 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 represent that the information you have marked consists of “confidential communications between attorneys for the city and city staff for the purpose of providing legal advice.” Upon review of the information at issue, we conclude that most of it is protected by the attorney-client privilege. We have marked the information that you may withhold pursuant to section 552.107(1). The remaining information at issue may not be withheld under section 552.107(1) because it does not involve the rendition of legal services.

Next, we address your claim section of 552.111 of the Government Code. Section 552.111 excepts from disclosure “an 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 section encompasses the attorney work product privilege found in rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. *City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351, 360 (Tex. 2000); Open Records Decision No. 677 at 4-8 (2002). Rule 192.5 defines work product as

(1) material prepared or mental impressions developed in anticipation of litigation or for trial by or for a party or a party’s representatives, including the party’s attorneys, consultants, sureties, indemnitors, insurers, employees, or agents; or

(2) a communication made in anticipation of litigation or for trial between a party and the party’s representatives or among a party’s representatives, including the party’s attorneys, consultants, sureties, indemnitors, insurers, employees or agents.

A governmental body seeking to withhold information under this exception bears the burden of demonstrating that the information was created or developed for trial or in anticipation of litigation by or for a party or a party’s representative. Tex. R. Civ. P. 192.5; ORD 677 at 6-8. In order for this office to conclude that the information was made or developed in anticipation of litigation, we must be satisfied that

a) a reasonable person would have concluded from the totality of the circumstances surrounding the investigation that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue; and b) the party resisting discovery believed in good faith that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue and [created or obtained the information] for the purpose of preparing for such litigation.

Nat’l Tank Co. v. Brotherton, 851 S.W.2d 193, 207 (Tex. 1993). A “substantial chance” of litigation does not mean a statistical probability, but rather “that litigation is more than merely an abstract possibility or unwarranted fear.” *Id.* at 204; ORD 677 at 7.

You explain that the information you have marked was “created or developed for trial or in anticipation of litigation by or for the city’s attorneys or representatives of the city’s attorneys.” Upon review of your arguments and the submitted information, we find that you

have demonstrated that the information you have marked was prepared for trial or in anticipation of litigation. Therefore, you may withhold this information under section 552.111 of the Government Code as attorney work product.

You also assert that portions of the submitted information are subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code. Section 552.117(a)(1) excepts the home address and telephone number, social security number, and family member information of a current or former employee of a governmental body who requests that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024. The determination of whether a particular item of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be made 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, the city may only withhold information under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date of the city's receipt of the request for the information. The city may not withhold information under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee who did not make a timely election for confidentiality under section 552.024. Therefore, if the former employee at issue made a timely election under section 552.024, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code.²

In the event that section 552.117 of the Government Code does not apply, the former employee's social security number may be confidential under federal law and therefore excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. The 1990 amendments to the federal Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I), make confidential social security numbers and related records that are obtained or maintained by a state agency or political subdivision of the state pursuant to any provision of law enacted on or after October 1, 1990. *See* Open Records Decision No. 622 (1994). We have no basis for concluding that the social security number at issue is confidential under section 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I) and therefore excepted from public disclosure under section 552.101 on the basis of that federal provision. We caution, however, that section 552.352 of the Act imposes criminal penalties for the release of confidential information. Prior to releasing the social security number at issue, you should ensure that it was not obtained or maintained by the city pursuant to any provision of law enacted on or after October 1, 1990.

You also note that the submitted documents include information relating to Texas-issued motor vehicle records. Section 552.130 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information [that] relates to . . . a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license or permit issued by an agency of this state [or] a motor vehicle title or registration issued by an agency of this state." Gov't Code § 552.130(a)(1), (2). We have marked the information the city must withhold pursuant to section 552.130 of the Government Code.

² As our ruling under section 552.117 is dispositive, we need not address your section 552.1175 claim against disclosure for this information.

Finally, you assert that the e-mail address you have marked is confidential under section 552.137 of the Government Code. 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* Gov’t Code § 552.137(a)-(c). Section 552.137 does not apply to a government employee’s work e-mail address because such an address is not that of the employee as a “member of the public” but is instead the address of the individual as a government employee. The e-mail address at issue is a work e-mail address of a city employee; thus, this e-mail address may not be withheld pursuant to section 552.137 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with common law privacy. Any CHRI that the city has in its possession must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code and the relevant state and federal provisions. The city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The city may withhold the documents it has marked as attorney work product under section 552.111 of the Government Code. If the former employee at issue made a timely election under section 552.024 to keep his section 552.117 information confidential, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. In the alternative, the submitted social security number may also be confidential under federal law. The marked Texas motor vehicle information must be withheld under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released to the requestor.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov’t Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the

Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Tex. Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Caroline E. Cho
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CEC/sdk

Ref: ID# 218760

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Jeremy Schwartz
Staff Writer
Austin American-Statesman
P.O. Box 670
Austin, Texas 78767
(w/o enclosures)