



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

August 13, 2014

Ms. Amy L. Sims  
Assistant City Attorney  
Office of the City Attorney  
City of Lubbock  
P.O. Box 2000  
Lubbock, Texas 79457

OR2014-14156

Dear Ms. Sims:

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# 532790.

The City of Lubbock (the "city") received a request for all e-mails between a named employee and members of the Electric Utility Board during a specified time period, and all e-mails between the same named employee and the city's human resources department during a specified time period. You claim portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.107, 552.117, and 552.133 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

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. You raise section 552.101 in conjunction with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 ("HIPAA") for portions of the submitted information. 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. *See* 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 (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 confidential information that is subject to disclosure under the Act, the city may not withhold any portion of the information at issue on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 181.006 of the Health and Safety Code, which provides the following:

[F]or a covered entity that is a governmental unit, an individual’s protected health information:

- (1) includes any information that reflects that an individual received health care from the covered entity; and
- (2) is not public information and is not subject to disclosure under [the Act].

Health & Safety Code § 181.006. Section 181.001(b)(2)(A) defines “covered entity” to include any person who:

- (A) for commercial, financial, or professional gain, monetary fees, or dues, or on a cooperative, nonprofit, or pro bono basis, engages, in whole or in part, and with real or constructive knowledge, in the practice of assembling, collecting, analyzing, using, evaluating, storing, or transmitting protected health information. The term includes a business associate, health care payer, governmental unit, information or computer management entity, school,

health researcher, health care facility, clinic, health care provider, or person who maintains an Internet site[.]

*Id.* § 181.001(b)(2)(A). You assert the city is a covered entity for purposes of section 181.006 of the Health and Safety Code. However, in order to determine whether the city is a covered entity, we must address whether the city engages in the practice of “assembling, collecting, analyzing, using, evaluating, storing, or transmitting protected health information.” *Id.* Section 181.001 states that “[u]nless otherwise defined in this chapter, each term that is used in this chapter has the meaning assigned by the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act and Privacy Standards.” *Id.* § 181.001(a). Accordingly, as chapter 181 does not define “protected health information,” we turn to HIPAA’s definition of the term. HIPAA defines “protected health information” as individually identifiable health information that is transmitted or maintained in electronic media or any other form or medium. *See* 45 C.F.R. § 160.103. HIPAA defines “individually identifiable health information” as information that is a subset of health information, including demographic information collected from an individual, and:

(1) Is created or received by a health care provider, health plan, employer, or health care clearinghouse; and

(2) Relates to the past, present, or future physical or mental health or condition of an individual; the provision of health care to an individual; or the past, present, or future payment for the provision of health care to an individual; and

(i) That identifies the individual; or

(ii) With respect to which there is a reasonable basis to believe the information can be used to identify the individual.

*Id.* The submitted information consists of emails between city employees. Although you assert the city is a covered entity, you have not explained how the submitted information consists of protected health information. Thus, we find you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 181.006 of the Health and Safety Code. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Section 552.101 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 the information we have marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the city must withhold this information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.<sup>1</sup> However, you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Thus, the remaining information may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

You also claim portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.102 of the Government Code. Section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure “information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.” Gov’t Code § 552.102(a). We understand you to assert the privacy analysis under section 552.102(a) is the same as the common-law privacy test under section 552.101 of the Government Code, which is discussed above. See *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. In *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Texas Newspapers, Inc.*, 652 S.W.2d 546, 549–51 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref’d n.r.e.), the court of appeals ruled the privacy test under section 552.102(a) is the same as the *Industrial Foundation* privacy test. However, the Texas Supreme Court has expressly disagreed with *Hubert’s* interpretation of section 552.102(a) and held the privacy standard under section 552.102(a) differs from the *Industrial Foundation* test under section 552.101. See *Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). The Supreme Court also considered the applicability of section 552.102(a) and held it excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. See *id.* at 348. Upon review, we find none of the remaining information at issue is excepted under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. Accordingly, none of the remaining information at issue may be withheld on that basis.

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 “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 Tex. Farmers Ins.*

---

<sup>1</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure for this information.

*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.<sup>4</sup> 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, 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 portions of the remaining information consist of communications between or among attorneys and city employees. You further state the communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the city. Further, we understand the confidentiality of the communications has been maintained. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information you marked. Accordingly, the city may withhold the information you marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup>

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). 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

---

<sup>2</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure for this information.

information. We note, and you acknowledge, the submitted information includes the election form of the employee at issue, where she elected confidentiality for her home address, telephone number, social security number, and family member information. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.133 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure a public power utility's information that is "reasonably related to a competitive matter." Gov't Code § 552.133(b). Section 552.133 provides, in relevant part, the following:

(a) In this section, "public power utility" means an entity providing electric or gas utility services that is subject to the provisions of this chapter.

(a-1) For purposes of this section, "competitive matter" means a utility-related matter that is related to the public power utility's competitive activity, including commercial information, and would, if disclosed, give advantage to competitors or prospective competitors. The term:

(1) means a matter that is reasonably related to the following categories of information:

(A) generation unit specific and portfolio fixed and variable costs, including forecasts of those costs, capital improvement plans for generation units, and generation unit operating characteristics and outage scheduling;

(B) bidding and pricing information for purchased power, generation and fuel, and Electric Reliability Council of Texas bids, prices, offers, and related services and strategies; [and]

(C) effective fuel and purchased power agreements and fuel transportation agreements and contracts;

(D) risk management information, contracts, and strategies, including fuel hedging and storage;

(E) plans, studies, proposals, and analyses for system improvements, additions, or sales, other than transmission and distribution system improvements inside the service area for which the public power utility is the sole certificated retail provider; and

(F) customer billing, contract, and usage information, electric power pricing information, system load characteristics, and electric power marketing analyses and strategies[.]

*Id.* § 552.133(a), (a-1)(1)(A)-(F). Section 552.133(a-1)(2) provides fifteen categories of information that are not competitive matters. *Id.* § 552.133(a-1)(2). You state Lubbock Power & Light (“LP&L”) is a municipally owned electric utility. Thus, you indicate LP&L is a public power utility for the purposes of section 552.133. You assert portions of the remaining information, which you have marked, pertain to a competitive matter of LP&L. Further, the information at issue is not among the fifteen categories of information expressly excluded from the definition of “competitive matter” by section 552.133(a-1)(2). Based on your representations and our review, we find the remaining information you marked relates to competitive matters as defined by section 552.133(a-1). Thus, we conclude the city must withhold the remaining information you marked under section 552.133 of the Government Code.

We note the remaining information contains an e-mail address that is subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup> Section 552.137 of the Government Code exempts 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). The e-mail address at issue is not excluded by subsection (c). Therefore, the city must withhold the personal e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner affirmatively consents to its public disclosure.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city may withhold the information you marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information you marked under section 552.133 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the personal e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner affirmatively consents to its public disclosure. 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.

---

<sup>3</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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](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,



Lauren Dahlstein  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

LMD/som

Ref: ID# 532790

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)