



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

May 5, 2006

Mr. Peter G. Smith
Nichols, Jackson, Dillard, Hager & Smith, L.L.P.
1800 Lincoln Plaza
500 North Akard
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2006-04657

Dear Mr. Smith:

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# 248271.

The City of Richardson (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information related to a named consultant hired by the city. You state that you have released some of the responsive information. You claim that the remaining requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." This section encompasses information protected by other statutes. You claim that a portion of the submitted information is subject to chapter 611 of the Health and Safety Code, which provides for the confidentiality of records created or maintained by a mental health professional. Section 611.002(a) states that "[c]ommunications between a patient and a professional, and

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.

records of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient that are created or maintained by a professional, are confidential.” Health & Safety Code § 611.002(a); *see also* 611.001 (defining “patient” and “professional”). However, upon review, we find that the submitted information does not contain mental health records. *See* Health & Safety Code § 611.002. Therefore, none of the submitted information is confidential under chapter 611 of the Health and Safety Code, and the city may not withhold it under section 552.101 on that ground.

You also assert that some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 in conjunction with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (“HIPAA”), 42 U.S.C. §§ 1320d-1320d-8. At the direction of Congress, the Secretary of Health and Human Services (“HHS”) promulgated regulations setting privacy standards for medical records, which HHS issued as the Federal Standards for Privacy of Individually Identifiable Health Information. *See* Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996, 42 U.S.C. § 1320d-2 (Supp. IV 1998) (historical & statutory note); Standards for Privacy of Individually Identifiable Health Information, 45 C.F.R. Pts. 160, 164 (“Privacy Rule”); *see also* Attorney General Opinion JC-0508 at 2 (2002). These standards govern the releasability of protected health information by a covered entity. *See* 45 C.F.R. pts. 160, 164. Under these standards, a covered entity may not use or disclose protected health information, excepted as provided by parts 160 and 164 of the Code of Federal Regulations. 45 C.F.R. § 164.502(a).

This office has addressed the interplay of the Privacy Rule and the Act. Open Records Decision No. 681 (2004). In that decision, we noted that section 164.512 of title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations provides that a covered entity may use or disclose protected health information to the extent that such use or disclosure is required by law and the use or disclosure complies with and is limited to the relevant requirements of such law. *See* 45 C.F.R. § 164.512(a)(1). We further noted that the Act “is a mandate in Texas law that compels Texas governmental bodies to disclose information to the public.” *See* Open Records Decision No. 681 at 8 (2004); *see also* Gov’t Code §§ 552.002, .003, .021. We therefore held that the disclosures under the Act come within section 164.512(a). Consequently, the Privacy Rule does not make information confidential for the purpose of section 552.101 of the Government Code. Open Records Decision No. 681 at 9 (2004); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 478 (1987) (as general rule, statutory confidentiality requires express language making information confidential). Because the Privacy Rule does not make information that is subject to disclosure under the Act confidential, the city may withhold requested protected health information from the public only if an exception in subchapter C of the Act applies.

We understand you to claim that some of the submitted information is also subject to section 402.083 of the Labor Code. Section 402.083(a) of the Labor Code states that “[i]nformation in or derived from a claim file regarding an employee is confidential and may not be disclosed by the [Texas Workers’ Compensation Commission (the “commission”)] except as provided by this subtitle.” Labor Code § 402.083(a). In Open Records Decision

No. 533 (1989), the City of Brownsville received a request for similar information. This office construed the predecessor to section 402.083(a) to apply only to information that the governmental body obtained from the Industrial Accident Board, now the commission. You have not informed us, and the documents do not reflect, that they were obtained from the commission. Therefore, the information at issue is not confidential under section 402.083, and it may not be withheld under section 552.101 on that basis.

Next, you raise section 552.101 in conjunction with certain provisions of the Texas Homeland Security Act. Specifically, you claim that the submitted emergency response plan for water system emergency is subject to sections 418.176 and 418.177 of the Government Code. In relevant part, section 418.176 provides:

(a) Information is confidential if the information is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental entity for the purpose of preventing, detecting, responding to, or investigating an act of terrorism or related criminal activity and:

(1) relates to staffing requirements of an emergency response provider, including law enforcement agency, a fire-fighting agency, or an emergency services agency;

(2) relates to a tactical plan of the provider[.]

Section 418.177 provides:

Information is confidential if the information:

(1) is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental entity for the purpose of preventing, detecting, or investigating an act of terrorism or related criminal activity; and

(2) relates to an assessment by or for a governmental entity, or an assessment that is maintained by a governmental entity, of the risk or vulnerability of persons or property, including critical infrastructure, to an act of terrorism or related criminal activity.

Gov't Code §§ 418.176(a), .177. The fact that information may relate to a governmental body's security concerns or emergency management activities does not make the information per se confidential under the Texas Homeland Security Act. *See* Open Records Decision No. 649 at 3 (1996) (language of confidentiality provision controls scope of its protection). Furthermore, the mere recitation by a governmental body of a statute's key terms is not sufficient to demonstrate the applicability of a claimed provision. As with any exception to disclosure, a governmental body asserting one of the confidentiality provisions of the Texas Homeland Security Act must adequately explain how the responsive records fall within the

scope of the claimed provision. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must explain how claimed exception to disclosure applies).

Upon review of the submitted information in Exhibit 2D, we find you have demonstrated that a portion of the information is maintained for the purpose of responding to an act of terrorism as it relates to an emergency response provider's staffing requirements and tactical plan. *See* Gov't Code § 418.176. As such, the city must withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.176 of the Government Code. However, we find that you have not demonstrated that the remaining submitted information is maintained for the purpose of responding to an act of terrorism as it relates to an emergency response provider's staffing requirements or tactical plan. *See* Gov't Code § 418.176. Moreover, we find that this information neither constitutes nor reveals the contents of a vulnerability assessment. *See* Gov't Code § 418.177. Thus, none of remaining information may be withheld on this basis.

Section 552.101 also encompasses the doctrine of common law privacy, which protects information that (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person and (2) is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). The type 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. This office has found that the following types of information are excepted from required public disclosure under common law privacy: 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); personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545 (1990); and identities of victims of sexual abuse, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 440 (1986), 393 (1983), 339 (1982). We have marked the information that the city must withhold under section 552.101 in conjunction with common law privacy.

Section 552.107 protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body maintains the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. *See* Open Records Decision No. 675 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate that the information at issue constitutes or documents a communication. *See 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. *See* 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. *See 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. See 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, see *id.* 503(b)(1), meaning that 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. See *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 the communication has been maintained. Section 552.107(1) generally excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected from disclosure 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 inform us that the information in Exhibit 2B reflects confidential communications exchanged between privileged parties in furtherance of the rendition of legal services to a client. Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we conclude that the city may withhold Exhibit 2B pursuant to section 552.107 of the Government Code.

You also claim section 552.111 of the Government Code. Section 552.111 excepts from required public disclosure interagency and intra-agency memoranda and letters, but only to the extent that they contain advice, opinion, or recommendation intended for use in the entity’s policymaking process. *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ); Open Records Decision No. 615 at 5 (1993). The purpose of this section is “to protect from public disclosure advice and opinions *on policy matters* and to encourage frank and open discussion within the agency in connection with its decision-making processes.” *Austin v. City of San Antonio*, 630 S.W.2d 391, 394 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1982, writ ref’d n.r.e.) (emphasis added). However, an agency’s policymaking functions do not encompass internal administrative or personnel matters, as disclosure of information relating to such matters will not inhibit free discussion among agency personnel as to policy issues. See *City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351 (Tex. 2000); *Lett v. Klein Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 917 S.W.2d 455 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1996, writ denied) (records relating to problems with specific employee do not relate to making of new policy but merely implement existing policy); Open Records Decision No. 615 at 5-6 (1993). *But see* Open Records Decision No. 631

(1995) (finding personnel matters of a broader scope were excepted from disclosure under section 552.111). Although you claim that the e-mails at issue in Exhibit 2C contain opinions, advice, and recommendations of city administrators, you have not explained how the submitted e-mails relate to the policymaking functions of the city. Based on our review of the information in Exhibit 2C, we conclude that the submitted e-mails pertain to internal administrative and personnel matters which are not protected under section 552.111. *See City of Garland*, 22 S.W.3d at 351. Accordingly, we find that you may not withhold the submitted e-mails in Exhibit 2C under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

We note that the remaining submitted documents contain information that may be excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who timely elect to keep this information confidential pursuant to section 552.024. You do not inform us whether any of the city employees at issue timely elected to keep information confidential. We therefore determine that if the individuals at issue timely elected to keep such information confidential pursuant to section 552.024, the city must withhold the information we have marked in the submitted documents pursuant to section 552.117(a)(1). If, however, the city employees did not timely elect to keep their information confidential, the city may not withhold this information under section 552.117(a)(1).

We note that the remaining submitted information contains e-mail addresses of members of the public. 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 specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). *See Gov't Code* § 552.137(a)-(c). We note that section 552.137 does not apply to the work e-mail addresses of officers or employees of a governmental body, a website address, or the general e-mail address of a business. The e-mail addresses at issue are not specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). Unless the individuals whose email addresses are at issue have consented to its release, we determine that the city must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked pursuant to section 552.137(a).

Finally, we note that some of the submitted information may be protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.* If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit. *See Open Records Decision No. 550* (1990).

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 418.176 of the Government Code. We have marked the information that the city must withhold under section 552.101 in conjunction with common law privacy. Exhibit 2B may be withheld pursuant to section 552.107 of the Government Code. If the individuals at issue timely elected to keep their information confidential pursuant to section 552.024, the city must withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.117(a)(1). If, however, the city employees at issue did not timely elect to keep their information confidential, the city may not withhold this information under section 552.117(a)(1). The marked e-mail addresses must be withheld pursuant to section 552.137(a). The remaining submitted information must be released to the requestor; however, in releasing information that is protected by copyright, the city must comply with applicable copyright law.

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); *Texas 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 Office of the Attorney General 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. 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,



Debbie K. Lee
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

DKL/eb

Ref: ID# 248271

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Dann Ronan
Senior Reporter
WFAA
606 Young Street
Dallas, Texas 75202
(w/o enclosures)