



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

December 5, 2013

Mr. L. Brian Narvaez
Assistant City Attorney
Langley & Banack
745 East Mulberry, Suite 900
San Antonio, Texas 78212-3166

OR2013-21161

Dear Mr. Narvaez:

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# 507702.

The City of Eagle Pass (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information relating to compensation of city employees and billing and payment information relating to the organization hired to conduct any compensation studies. You indicate the city will release some of the requested information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.111 of the Government Code. Additionally, you state release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of Jacobsen, Betts & Company ("JB"). Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified JB of the request for information and of its 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 received comments from JB.¹ We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note Exhibits B and C are subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides, in relevant part:

(a) [T]he following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

(1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). Exhibits B and C consist of a completed report subject to subsection 552.022(a)(1). The city must release the completed report pursuant to subsection 552.022(a)(1) unless it is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or expressly made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* Although you and JB raise section 552.111 of the Government Code for this information, section 552.111 is a discretionary exception to disclosure and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions), 470 at 7 (1987) (deliberative process privilege under statutory predecessor to section 552.111 subject to waiver).* Therefore, no portion of the information in Exhibits B and C may be withheld under section 552.111. However, JB raises section 552.101 for this information. As section 552.101 can make information confidential under the Act, we will consider the applicability of this section to the information subject to section 552.022. Additionally, we will consider your argument under section 552.111 for Exhibit D.

First, JB argues the submitted information may not be released because JB provided the information to the city under a licensing agreement and JB has not granted permission to release the submitted information. However, information is not confidential under the Act simply because the party submitting the information anticipates or requests that it be kept confidential. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976). In other words, a governmental body cannot, through an agreement or contract, overrule or

¹We note JB raises section 552.026 of the Government Code, which incorporates the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), section 1232g of title 20 of the United States Code, into the Act. FERPA governs the disclosure of education records maintained by educational institutions or agencies that receive federal funds and is applicable only to education records than an educational institution either maintains or has directly transferred to a third party. Thus, because the city is not an educational institution and does not indicate that any of the submitted information was received from an educational institution, FERPA is not applicable in this instance.

repeal provisions of the Act. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 3 (1990) (“[T]he obligations of a governmental body under [the predecessor to the Act] cannot be compromised simply by its decision to enter into a contract.”), 203 at 1 (1978) (mere expectation of confidentiality by person supplying information does not satisfy requirements of statutory predecessor to Gov’t Code § 552.110). Consequently, unless the information falls within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any expectations or agreement specifying otherwise.

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. This section encompasses information other statutes make confidential. JB claims the release of the submitted information could be a violation of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (“HIPAA”). 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* HIPAA, 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 section 164.512 of title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations provides a covered entity may use or disclose protected health information to the extent 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 the Act “is a mandate in Texas law that compels Texas governmental bodies to disclose information to the public.” *See* ORD 681 at 8; *see also* Gov’t Code §§ 552.002, .003, .021. We therefore held 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. *See Abbott v Tex. Dep’t of Mental Health & Mental Retardation*, 212 S.W.3d 648 (Tex. App.—Austin 2006, no pet.); ORD 681 at 9; *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 confidential information that is subject to disclosure under the Act, the city may not withhold any portion of the submitted information on that basis.

As stated above, section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses information other statutes make confidential. JB asserts the submitted information is protected by the Privacy

Act of 1974, section 552a of title 5 of the United States Code ("Federal Privacy Act"). However, the Federal Privacy Act applies only to a federal agency. See 5 U.S.C. §§ 552(f), 552a(a). State and local government agencies are not covered by the Federal Privacy Act. See *Davidson v. Georgia*, 622 F. 2d 895, 896 (5th Cir. 1980); see also Attorney General Opinion MW-95 (1979). Because the city is not a federal agency, it is not bound by the Federal Privacy Act's confidentiality provisions as would be a federal agency. See 5 U.S.C. §§ 552a(a)(1), 552(f) (defining "agency" for purposes of Federal Privacy Act). Therefore, no portion of the submitted information can be considered confidential by law pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the Federal Privacy Act.

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 Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. 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 JB has failed to demonstrate any portion of the submitted information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Thus, no portion of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Next, we address section 552.111 for the information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.111 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, no writ); 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).

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).

Section 552.111 can also encompass communications between a governmental body and a third party, including a consultant or other party with a privity of interest. 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.

You state the information in Exhibit D consists of a communication from JB, a city consultant, to the city that represents the consultant's advice, recommendations, and opinions regarding administrative and personnel matters of broad scope that affect the city's policy mission. Based on your representations and our review, we find the city may withhold the information in Exhibit D under section 552.111.

JB states some of the remaining information is 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. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; see Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). 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.

In summary, the city may withhold the information in Exhibit D under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information; however, any information subject to copyright may be released only in accordance with copyright law.

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,



David L. Wheelus
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

DLW/akg

Ref: ID# 507702

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Vance B. Jacobsen
Jacobsen, Betts & Company
P.O. Box 10036
Seattle, Washington 98110
(w/o enclosures)