



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 17, 2019

Mr. Matthew J. Longoria
Counsel for the City of Copperas Cove
Denton, Navarro, Rocha, Bernal & Zech, P. C.
2517 North Main Avenue
San Antonio, Texas 78212-4685

OR2019-35664

Dear Mr. Longoria:

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# 803656 (W005624).

The City of Copperas Cove (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information related to the employment of a named individual. The city states it released some information to the requestor. The city states it will withhold social security numbers under section 552.147(b) of the Government Code and other information pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.111, 552.115, 552.117, 552.122, 552.130, and 552.147 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. This section also encompasses information made confidential by the Medical Practice Act ("MPA"), subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code, which governs release of medical records. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides, in relevant part:

¹ Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.147(b). Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination issued by this office authorizing all governmental bodies to withhold certain categories of information without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

(a) A communication between a physician and a patient, relative to or in connection with any professional services as a physician to the patient, is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

(b) A record of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that is created or maintained by a physician is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

(c) A person who receives information from a confidential communication or record as described by this chapter, other than a person listed in Section 159.004 who is acting on the patient's behalf, may not disclose the information except to the extent that disclosure is consistent with the authorized purposes for which the information was first obtained.

Occ. Code § 159.002(a)-(c). Information subject to the MPA includes both medical records and information obtained from those medical records. *See id.* §§ 159.002, .004. This office has concluded the protection afforded by section 159.002 extends only to records created by either a physician or someone under the supervision of a physician. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 487 (1987), 370 (1983), 343 (1982).*

Upon review, we find a portion of the submitted information, which we marked, constitutes records of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that were created or are maintained by a physician and information obtained from a patient's medical records. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA.² In addition, we note some of the remaining information was created by a nurse. The city must withhold these documents under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA only if they were created under the supervision of a physician, or if they contain information taken directly from records created by or under the supervision of a physician. If the documents created by a nurse were not created under the supervision of a physician, or if they do not contain information taken directly from records created by or under the supervision of a physician, they are not subject to the MPA and the city may not withhold them under section 552.101 on that basis. However, no portion of the remaining information constitutes medical records subject to section 159.002 of the Occupations Code. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 730.004 of the Transportation Code, which provides, “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of law to the contrary, including [the Act], except as provided by Sections 730.005-730.007, an agency may not disclose personal information about any person obtained by the agency in connection with a motor vehicle record.” Transp. Code § 730.004. Section 730.004 applies only to an “agency” that compiles or maintains motor vehicle records. *See id.* § 730.003(1). You have not established the city is an agency that compiles or maintains motor vehicle

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

records for purposes of chapter 730. Therefore, section 730.004 does not apply to the city. Consequently, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 730.004 of the Transportation Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 611.002 of the Health and Safety Code, which provides, in part, as follows:

(a) Communications between a patient and a professional, and records of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient that are created or maintained by a professional, are confidential.

(b) Confidential communications or records may not be disclosed except as provided by Section 611.004 or 611.0045.

Health & Safety Code § 611.002(a)-(b); *see id.* § 611.001 (defining “patient” and “professional”). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the mental health records we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 611.002 of the Health and Safety Code.³ However, we find no portion of the remaining information constitutes mental health records for the purposes of section 611.002 of the Health and Safety Code. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information protected by section 1703.306 of the Occupations Code, which provides:

(a) A polygraph examiner, trainee, or employee of a polygraph examiner, or a person for whom a polygraph examination is conducted or an employee of the person, may not disclose information acquired from a polygraph examination to another person other than:

- (1) the examinee or any other person specifically designated in writing by the examinee;
- (2) the person that requested the examination;
- (3) a member, or the member’s agent, of a governmental agency that licenses a polygraph examiner or supervises or controls a polygraph examiner’s activities;
- (4) another polygraph examiner in private consultation; or
- (5) any other person required by due process of law.

³ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

(b) The [Texas Department of Licensing and Regulation] or any other governmental agency that acquires information from a polygraph examination under this section shall maintain the confidentiality of the information.

Occ. Code § 1703.306(a), (b). The remaining information contains information acquired from a polygraph examination. The requestor does not fall within any of the categories of individuals who have a right of access to the submitted polygraph information under section 1703.306(a). Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1703.306 of the Occupations Code. However, upon review, we find no portion of the remaining information constitutes information acquired from a polygraph examination for the purposes of section 1703.306(a) of the Occupations Code. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

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.”⁴ Gov’t Code § 552.102(a). The Texas Supreme Court has considered the applicability of section 552.102, and has held section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336, 348 (Tex. 2010). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the date of birth we marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code.⁵

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 found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992) (employee’s withholding allowance certificate, designation of retirement beneficiary, choice of insurance carrier, election of optional coverages, direct deposit authorization, forms allowing employee to allocate pretax compensation to group insurance, health care or dependent care), 545 (1990) (deferred compensation information, participation in voluntary investment program, election of optional insurance coverage, mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history), 523 (1989) (common-law privacy protects credit reports, financial statements, and other personal financial information), 455 at 9 (employment applicant’s

⁴ The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

⁵ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

salary information not private). However, there is a legitimate public interest in the essential facts about a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body. See Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 9 (information revealing employee participates in group insurance plan funded partly or wholly by governmental body is not excepted from disclosure), 423 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow). This office has also concluded the public has a legitimate interest in information that relates to public employees and their conduct in the workplace. See, e.g., Open Records Decision Nos. 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), 470 at 4 (job performance does not generally constitute public employee's private affairs), 444 at 3 (1986) (public has obvious interest in information concerning qualifications and performance of government employees), 405 at 2 (1983) (manner in which public employee's job was performed cannot be said to be of minimal public interest). Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. ORD 455.

Upon review, we conclude some of the remaining information meets the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must generally withhold the information, which we marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, it is not clear whether the payroll deductions and benefits at issue reflect mandatory participation by the employee at issue or are the employee's voluntary financial decisions. Thus, to the extent the payroll deduction and benefit information we marked reflects the individual's voluntary allocations of salary to optional investment, retirement, or other financial programs offered by the city, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, to the extent the information at issue reflects the individual at issue's mandatory participation in the city's retirement program or benefits paid by the city, the city may not withhold the marked information on that basis. Further, the city has failed to demonstrate that the remaining information is highly intimate and embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 on that ground.

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).

The city argues the remaining information consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations of the city regarding policy making decisions. However, upon review, we find the remaining information is purely administrative or factual. Thus, the city failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue is subject to the deliberative process privilege. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the remaining information at issue under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Section 552.115 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[a] birth or death record maintained by the bureau of vital statistics of the Texas Department of Health or a local registration official[.]” Gov't Code § 552.115(a). Section 552.115 is applicable only to information maintained by the bureau of vital statistics or local registration officials. See Open Records Decision No. 338 (1982) (finding that statutory predecessor to section 552.115 excepted only those birth and death records which are maintained by the bureau of vital statistics and local registration officials). Because section 552.115 of the Government Code does not apply to information held by the city, the city may not withhold the birth certificate in the remaining information on this basis.

Section 552.117(a)(16) 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 firefighter or volunteer firefighter or emergency medical services personnel as defined by Section 773.003 of the Health and Safety Code, regardless of whether the current or former employee complies with section 552.024 or 552.1175. Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(16). Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(16) of the Government Code.⁶

Section 552.122 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[a] test item developed by a licensing agency or governmental body[.]” *Id.* § 552.122(b). In Open Records Decision No. 626 (1994), this office determined that the term “test item” in section 552.122 includes “any standard means by which an individual's or group's knowledge or ability in

⁶ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

a particular area is evaluated.” 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.* at 6. 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). Section 552.122 also protects the answers to test questions when the answers might reveal the questions themselves. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-640 at 3 (1987); ORD 626 at 8.

The city seeks to withhold some of the remaining information under section 552.122 of the Government Code. However, upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate any portion of the remaining information constitutes a test item or reveals test questions. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.122(a) of the Government Code.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator’s license, driver’s license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.130. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.136(b) of the Government Code provides, “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential.” *Id.* § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). Therefore, the city must withhold the account number we marked under section 552.136 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). *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 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 the MPA; however, the city must withhold the documents created by a nurse under the MPA only if they were created under the supervision of a physician, or if they contain information taken directly from records created by or under the supervision of a physician. The city must withhold the mental health records we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 611.002 of the Health and Safety Code. The city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1703.306 of the Occupations Code. The city must withhold the date of birth we marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. To the extent the payroll deduction and benefit information we marked reflects the individual’s voluntary allocations of salary to optional investment, retirement, or other financial programs offered by the city, the city must withhold this information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the remaining information

we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(16) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the account number we marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the personal e-mail address we marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner affirmatively consents to its public disclosure. The city 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 <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open-government/members-public/what-expect-after-ruling-issued> or call the OAG's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Public Information Act may be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the OAG, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Sean McCormick
Attorney
Open Records Division

SMC/be

Ref: ID# 803656

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)