



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 6, 2016

Mr. Douglas E. Manning
Assistant County Attorney
Orange County
801 Division
Orange, Texas 77630

OR2016-26981

Dear Mr. Manning:

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# 636440 (Request ID 66001042).

Orange County (the "county") received a request for e-mails sent between three named county officials during a specified time period. You state the county has released some of the requested information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, 552.110, 552.131, and 552.137 of the Government Code. You also state release of some of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of a third party. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified Entergy-Texas 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 considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Although the county argues some of the submitted information is excepted under section 552.110 of the Government Code, that exception is designed to protect the interests of third parties, not the interests of a governmental body. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110 (excepts from disclosure trade secret or commercial or financial information obtained from third party). Thus, we do not address the county's argument under section 552.110. We note an

interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See id.* § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received comments from Entergy-Texas explaining why its information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude Entergy-Texas has a protected proprietary interest in the submitted information. *See id.* § 552.110; Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3. Accordingly, the county may not withhold any of the information at issue on the basis of any proprietary interest Entergy-Texas may have in it.

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. The county raises section 552.101 in conjunction with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 ("HIPAA") for 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* 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 addressed the interplay of the Privacy Rule and the Act. Open Records Decision No. 681 (2004). In Open Records Decision No. 681, 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. *Id.*; *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." ORD 681 at 8; *see also* Gov't Code §§ 552.002, .003, .021. Therefore, we 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 at 2 (1987) (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 county may not withhold any portion of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

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. This office has also found that personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision No. 600 (1992) (public employee's withholding allowance certificate, designation of beneficiary of employee's retirement benefits, direct deposit authorization, and employee's decisions regarding voluntary benefits programs, among others, protected under common-law privacy). However, information pertaining to the work conduct and job performance of public employees is subject to a legitimate public interest and therefore generally not protected from disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 444 at 5-6 (1986) (public has interest in public employee's qualifications and performance and the circumstances of public employee's resignation or termination), 423 at 2 (1984). Generally, however, the public has a legitimate interest in information that relates to public employment and public employees. *See* Open Records Decision No. 562 at 10 (1990) (personnel file information does not involve most intimate aspects of human affairs, but in fact touches on matters of legitimate public concern). Information pertaining to the work conduct and job performance of public employees is subject to a legitimate public interest and, therefore, generally not protected from disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (public employee's job performance does not generally constitute employee's private affairs), 455 (1987) (public employee's job performance or abilities generally not protected by privacy), 444 (public has legitimate interest in knowing reasons for dismissal, demotion, promotion, or resignation of public employee), 423 at 2 (scope of public employee privacy is narrow). Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* ORD 455. We note that the fact that a public employee is sick is public information, but specific information about illnesses is excepted from disclosure. *See* ORD 470 at 4.

Upon review, we find the information we have marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the county must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The county has failed to demonstrate, however, the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public interest. Therefore, the county may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information subject to 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 “to facilitate 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. 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. 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: (A) to whom disclosure is made to further the rendition of professional legal services to the client; or (B) reasonably necessary to transmit 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 the information you have marked constitutes communications between a county attorney, county employees, and county officials that were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the county. You also state the communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find the county may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107(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, emergency contact information, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who request this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government

Code.¹ *See* Gov't Code § 552.117(a); Open Records Decision No. 622 (1994). Whether a particular piece of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time the request for it is made. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Thus, information may only be withheld 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 governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. 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). We have marked the personal information of county employees and county officials. If the employees and officials whose personal information is at issue timely elected to keep their information confidential pursuant to section 552.024, the county must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the county may only withhold the marked personal cellular telephone numbers under section 552.117(a)(1) if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone services. The county may not withhold this information under section 552.117(a)(1) if the employees or officials did not timely elect to keep their information confidential pursuant to section 552.024.

Section 552.131 of the Government Code relates to economic development information and provides, in part:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if the information relates to economic development negotiations involving a governmental body and a business prospect that the governmental body seeks to have locate, stay, or expand in or near the territory of the governmental body and the information relates to:

(1) a trade secret of the business prospect; or

(2) commercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that disclosure would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained.

(b) Unless and until an agreement is made with the business prospect, information about a financial or other incentive being offered to the business prospect by the governmental body or by another person is excepted from [required public disclosure].

¹The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

Gov't Code § 552.131 (a)-(b). Section 552.131(a) protects the proprietary interests of third parties that have provided information to governmental bodies, not the interests of governmental bodies themselves. There has been no demonstration by a third party that any of the information at issue constitutes a trade secret or that release of any of the information at issue would cause a third party substantial competitive harm. *See* Open Record Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999), 552 at 5 (1990). Thus, the county may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.131(a) of the Government Code.

Section 552.131(b) of the Government Code protects information about a financial or other incentive that is being offered to a business prospect by a governmental body or another person. Gov't Code § 552.131(b). You state some of the remaining information is related to prospective professional services pertaining to economic development on behalf of the county. However, upon review, we find no portion of the information at issue pertains to a financial or other incentive offered to a business prospect by a governmental body or another person. Accordingly, the county may not withhold any of the remaining submitted information under section 552.131(b) of the Government Code.

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 of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). Section 552.137 does not apply to an institutional e-mail address, the general e-mail address of a business, an e-mail address of a person who has a contractual relationship with a governmental body, an e-mail address of a vendor who seeks to contract with a governmental body, an e-mail address maintained by a governmental entity for one of its officials or employees, or an e-mail address provided to a governmental body on a letterhead. *See id.* § 552.137(c). We are unable to determine whether the personal e-mail addresses within the remaining information at issue, which are located within e-mails communicating official business of the county, belong to county officials or employees. Thus, we rule conditionally. To the extent the e-mail addresses within the remaining information are the personal e-mail addresses of county officials or employees, or to the extent subsection (c) applies, this information is not subject to section 552.137 and may not be withheld on that basis. *See Austin Bulldog v. Leffingwell*, 490 S.W.3d 240 (Tex. App.—Austin 2016, no pet.) (holding personal e-mail addresses of government officials used to conduct official government business are not e-mail addresses of “members of the public” for purposes of Gov't Code § 552.137(a)). However, to the extent the e-mail addresses within the remaining information are not the personal e-mail addresses of county officials or employees and subsection (c) does not apply, this information is subject to section 552.137 and must be withheld under section 552.137, unless the owners of the e-mail addresses affirmatively consent to their release.


In summary, the county must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The

county may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. If the employees and official whose personal information is at issue timely elected to keep their information confidential pursuant to section 552.024, the county must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the county may only withhold the marked personal cellular telephone numbers under section 552.117(a)(1) if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone services. To the extent the e-mail addresses within the remaining information are not the personal e-mail addresses of county officials or employees and subsection (c) does not apply, the county must withhold them under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners of the e-mail addresses affirmatively consent to their release. 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.

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,



Jennifer Luttrall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JL/akg

Ref: ID# 636440

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Third Party
(w/o enclosures)