



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 26, 2019

Ms. Melanie J. Rodney
Assistant County Attorney
Harris County
2525 Holly Hall, Suite 190
Houston, Texas 77054

OR2019-08345

Dear Ms. Rodney:

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# 756501 (CA File No. 19HSPOOL6).

The Harris County Hospital District d/b/a Harris Health System (the "system") received a request for communications pertaining to a specified public information request sent by the requestor and a particular cost estimate sent by the system to the requestor. You state the system has released some information. The system claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, 552.117, 552.137, and 552.139 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the claimed exceptions and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. *See* Gov't Code § 552.107(1). 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 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.

¹Although you cite section 552.137 of the Government Code, we understand you to raise section 552.139 based on the substance of your argument.

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 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 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).

The system states Exhibits B and E consist of communications involving attorneys for the system and system employees that were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the system. The system states these communications were intended to be, and have remained, confidential. Based on the system’s representations and our review, we find the system has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Thus, the system may generally withhold Exhibits B and E under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.² We note, however, some of these e-mail strings include e-mails received from or sent to non-privileged parties. Furthermore, if the e-mails received from or sent to the non-privileged parties are removed from the e-mail strings and stand alone, they are responsive to the request for information. Therefore, if the non-privileged e-mails, which we have marked, are maintained by the system separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then the system may not withhold the non-privileged e-mails under section 552.107(1).

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. Section 552.101 encompasses confidentiality provisions such as section 161.032 of the Health and Safety Code, which provides in relevant part:

(c) Records, information, or reports of a . . . compliance officer and records, information, or reports provided by a . . . compliance officer to the governing

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the system’s remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

body of a public hospital, hospital district, or hospital authority are not subject to disclosure under [the Act].

...

(e) The records, information, and reports received or maintained by a compliance officer retain the protection provided by this section only if the records, information, or reports are received, created, or maintained in the exercise of a proper function of the compliance officer as provided by the Office of Inspector General of the United States Department of Health and Human Services.

(f) This section . . . do[es] not apply to records made or maintained in the regular course of business by a hospital, . . . university medical center or health science center, [or] hospital district[.]

Health & Safety Code § 161.032(c), (e), (f); *see Mem'l Hosp.-The Woodlands v. McCown*, 927 S.W.2d 1 (Tex. 1996) (stating reference to statutory predecessor to section 160.007 of the Occupations Code in section 161.032 is clear signal records should be accorded same treatment under both statutes in determining if they were made in ordinary course of business). We note the phrase “records made or maintained in the regular course of business” has been construed to mean records that are neither created nor obtained in connection with a medical committee’s deliberative proceedings. *See Mem'l Hosp.*, 927 S.W.2d at 10 (discussing *Barnes v. Whittington*, 751 S.W.2d 493 (Tex. 1988); *Jordan v. Fourth Supreme Judicial Dist.*, 701 S.W.2d 644 (Tex. 1986)).

Although you assert the remaining information in Exhibits B, C, and D is confidential under section 161.032(e), upon review, we find the system has failed to demonstrate how this information was not created in the regular course of business. *See id.* 161.032(f). Thus, we conclude the system may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 161.032(e) of the Health and Safety Code.

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, 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). We note the information in Exhibits C and D pertains to a routine internal administrative matter. Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate the information at issue pertains to policymaking matters of the system for the purposes section 552.111 of the Government Code. Accordingly, the system may not withhold any portion of Exhibit C or D under section 552.111 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). The e-mail addresses at issue are not a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c) of the Government Code. Accordingly, the system must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners of the e-mail addresses affirmatively consent to their disclosure.

Section 552.139 of the Government Code provides, in part:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information that relates to computer network security, to restricted information under Section 2059.055 [of the Government Code], or to the design, operation, or defense of a computer network.

Id. § 552.139(a). Section 2059.055 of the Government Code provides, in pertinent part:

(b) Network security information is confidential under this section if the information is:

- (1) related to passwords, personal identification numbers, access codes, encryption, or other components of the security system of a state agency;
- (2) collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental entity to prevent, detect, or investigate criminal activity; or
- (3) related to an assessment, made by or for a governmental entity or maintained by a governmental entity, of the vulnerability of a network to criminal activity.

Id. § 2059.055(b). You assert Exhibit D is confidential under section 552.139. However, upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate any of the information at issue relates to computer network security, to restricted information under section 2059.055, or to the design, operation, or defense of a computer network as contemplated in section 552.139(a). Consequently, the system may not withhold any portion of Exhibit D under section 552.139 of the Government 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 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 conclude the information we have marked meets the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the system must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

We note some of the remaining information may be subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code.³ Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the current and former home addresses and telephone numbers, emergency contact information, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former employees of a governmental body who request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). Section 552.117(a)(1) also applies to the personal cellular telephone number of a current or former official or employee of a governmental body, provided the cellular telephone service is not paid by a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-6 (1988). Whether

³The 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 No. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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). Therefore, a governmental body must withhold information under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee only if the individual made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for this information was made. Accordingly, if the employees whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code and the cellular telephone services are not paid for by a governmental body, the system must withhold the cellular telephone numbers we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. Conversely, if the employees at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024 or the cellular telephone services are paid for by a governmental body, the system may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.117(a)(1).

In summary, the system may generally withhold Exhibits B and E under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code; however, if the non-privileged e-mails, which we have marked, are maintained by the system separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then the system may not withhold the non-privileged e-mails under section 552.107(1). The system must withhold the personal e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure. The system 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 employees whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code and the cellular telephone services are not paid for by a governmental body, the system must withhold the cellular telephone numbers we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The system must release the remaining information.⁴

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

⁴We note the information being released contains an e-mail address to which the requestor has a right of access under section 552.137(b) of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.137(b). However, Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009) is a previous determination authorizing all governmental bodies to withhold specific categories of information without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision, including e-mail addresses of members of the public under section 552.137 of the Government Code. Thus, if the system receives another request for this same information from a person who does not have a right of access to it, Open Records Decision No. 684 authorizes the system to redact the requestor's e-mail address without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Erin Groff". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Erin" and last name "Groff" clearly distinguishable.

Erin Groff
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

EMG/gw

Ref: ID# 756501

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)