



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 8, 2016

Ms. Christina A. Tillett
Counsel for the City of Bonham
Munson, Munson, Cardwell & Tillett
123 South Travis
Sherman, Texas 75090-5928

OR2016-02987

Dear Ms. Tillett:

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# 597355.

The Bonham Fire Department (the "department"), which you represent, received a request for fourteen categories of information. You state the department has released some of the requested information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.111, 552.117, and 552.122 of the Government Code. Additionally, you provide documentation showing you have notified five individuals of their rights to submit comments to this office explaining why the submitted information should not be released.¹ See Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released). 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." *Id.* § 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

¹As of the date of this letter, this office has not received comments from any third party explaining why any of the submitted information should not be released.

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 department may not withhold any portion of the information at issue on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information protected by section 773.091 of the Health and Safety Code, which provides in part:

(b) Records of the identity, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by emergency medical services personnel or by a physician providing medical supervision that are created by the emergency medical services personnel or physician or maintained by an emergency medical services provider are confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

...

(g) The privilege of confidentiality under this section does not extend to information regarding the presence, nature of injury or illness, age, sex, occupation, and city of residence of a patient who is receiving emergency medical services.

Health & Safety Code § 773.091(b), (g). Upon review, we find section 773.091 is not applicable to any portion of Exhibit E or Exhibit F. Thus, the department may not withhold the Exhibit E or Exhibit F under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 773.091(b) of the Health and Safety Code.

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 highly intimate or 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).

In *Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied), the court addressed the applicability of the common-law privacy doctrine to files of an investigation of allegations of sexual harassment. The investigation files in *Ellen* contained individual witness statements, an affidavit by the individual accused of the misconduct responding to the allegations, and conclusions of the board of inquiry that conducted the investigation. *Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d at 525. The court ordered the release of the affidavit of the person under investigation and the conclusions of the board of inquiry, stating the public's interest was sufficiently served by the disclosure of such documents. *Id.* In concluding, the *Ellen* court held "the public did not possess a legitimate interest in the identities of the individual witnesses, nor the details of their personal statements beyond what is contained in the documents that have been ordered released." *Id.* Thus, if there is an adequate summary of an investigation of alleged sexual harassment, the investigation summary must be released under *Ellen*, along with the statement of the accused. However, the identities of the victims and witnesses of the alleged sexual harassment must be redacted, and their detailed statements must be withheld from disclosure. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 393 (1983), 339 (1982). However, when no adequate summary exists, detailed statements regarding the allegations must be released, but the identities of victims and witnesses must still be redacted from the statements. In either case, the identity of the individual accused of sexual harassment is not protected from public disclosure.

In this instance, some of the submitted information is related to a sexual harassment investigation and does not include an adequate summary. Therefore, the department must generally release the information pertaining to the investigation. However, this information contains the identities of the alleged sexual harassment victims and witnesses. Therefore, the department must withhold the identifying information of the alleged victims and witnesses, which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and *Ellen*. *See* 840 S.W.2d at 525. Further, we find

the additional information we have marked satisfies the standards articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the department must withhold the additional information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find the department has not demonstrated any portion of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the remaining information may not be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

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[.]” 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 Texas 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 no portion of the remaining information is subject to section 552.102(a) of the Government Code, and the department may not withhold it on that basis.

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).

Further, section 552.111 does not protect facts and written observations of facts and events that are 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).

Upon review, we find the information at issue is general administrative and purely factual information. Thus, we find you have failed to show the information at issue consists of advice, opinions, or recommendations on the policymaking matters of the department. Accordingly, the remaining information in Exhibits C, D, I, J, K, and S may not be withheld under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

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). We note section 552.117 is also applicable to personal cellular telephone numbers, provided the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. See Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-6 (1988) (section 552.117 not applicable to cellular telephone numbers paid for by governmental body and intended for official use). 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 information. Information may not be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee or official who did not timely request under section 552.024 the information be kept confidential. Therefore, to the extent the individuals whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the marked cellular telephone number may be withheld only if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service. Conversely, to the extent the individuals whose information is at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024, the department may not withhold the marked information under

section 552.117(a)(1). We find the remaining information you have marked is not subject to section 552.117(a)(1), and the department may not withhold it on that basis.

Section 552.122 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure “[a] test item developed by a . . . governmental body[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.122(b). In Open Records Decision No. 626 (1994), this office determined the term “test item” in section 552.122 includes “any standard means by which an individual’s or group’s knowledge or ability in a particular area is evaluated,” but does not encompass evaluations of an employee’s overall job performance or suitability. ORD 626 at 6. The question of whether specific information falls within the scope of section 552.122(b) must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *Id.* Traditionally, this office has applied section 552.122 where release of “test items” might compromise the effectiveness of future examinations. *Id.* at 4-5; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 118 (1976).

You state Exhibits M and N contains application evaluations and testing results pertaining to a department employee. Thus, you argue the information at issue constitutes test items for purposes of section 552.122(b). Based on your representations and our review, we conclude the information we have marked qualifies as “test items” under section 552.122(b) of the Government Code. We also find the release of the individual’s answers to these questions would tend to reveal the questions themselves. Therefore, the department may withhold the questions and answers we have marked under section 552.122(b) of the Government Code. However, we find the remaining information in Exhibits M and N is not subject to section 552.122(b), and the department may not withhold it on that basis.

We note the remaining information contains an e-mail address that is subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code.² 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). The e-mail address at issue is not excluded by subsection (c). Therefore, the department 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 department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. To the extent the individuals whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the cellular

²The 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).

telephone number we have marked may only be withheld if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service. The department may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.122(b) of the Government Code. The department 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 department 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,



Nicholas A. Ybarra
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

NAY/bw

Ref: ID# 597355

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)