



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 13, 2020

Ms. Jessica Marsh  
General Counsel  
Texas Civil Commitment Office  
4616 West Howard Lane, Building 2, Suite 350  
Austin, Texas 78728

OR2020-10807

Dear Ms. Marsh:

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# 821146 (PIA 2020-0005).

The Texas Civil Commitment Office (the "TCCO") received a request for specified types of notes pertaining to the requestor during a stated period of time and certain information related to a test administered to the requestor. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.111 of the Government Code. Additionally, you state release of some of the information at issue may implicate the proprietary interests of Behavioral Technology, Inc. and The Edd Clinic for Psychotherapy and Counseling (the "Edd Clinic"). Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation demonstrating, the TCCO notified these interested third parties of the request for information and of their 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 received comments from the Edd Clinic. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information, some of which consists of a representative sample.<sup>1</sup>

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

---

<sup>1</sup> We assume the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

Code § 552.101. This section encompasses information made confidential by other statutes, such as chapter 611 of the Health and Safety Code. Section 611.002 pertains to mental health records and provides, in pertinent part:

(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”). Section 611.001 defines a “professional” as (1) a person authorized to practice medicine, (2) a person licensed or certified by the state to diagnose, evaluate or treat mental or emotional conditions or disorders, or (3) a person the patient reasonably believes is authorized, licensed, or certified. *See id.* § 611.001(2). Sections 611.004 and 611.0045 provide for access to mental health records only by certain individuals. *See id.* §§ 611.004, .0045; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 565 (1990). Upon review, we find some of the submitted information consists of mental health records that are subject to chapter 611 of the Health and Safety Code. Accordingly, the TCCO must withhold the information you marked and the additional information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 611.002 of the Health and Safety Code.<sup>2</sup>

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the constitutional right to privacy. Constitutional privacy protects two kinds of interests. *See Whalen v. Roe*, 429 U.S. 589, 599-600 (1977); Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 3-5 (1992), 478 at 4 (1987), 455 at 3-7 (1987). The first is the interest in independence in making certain important decisions related to the “zones of privacy,” pertaining to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education, that have been recognized by the United States Supreme Court. *See Fajjo v. Coon*, 633 F.2d 1172 (5th Cir. 1981); ORD 455 at 3-7. The second constitutionally protected privacy interest is in freedom from public disclosure of certain personal matters. *See Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Tex.*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985); ORD 455 at 6-7. This aspect of constitutional privacy balances the individual’s privacy interest against the public’s interest in the information. *See* ORD 455 at 7. Constitutional privacy under section 552.101 is reserved for “the most intimate aspects of human affairs.” *Id.* at 8 (quoting *Ramie*, 765 F.2d at 492).

This office has applied constitutional privacy to protect certain information about incarcerated individuals. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 430 (1985), 428 (1985), 185

---

<sup>2</sup> As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the submitted argument against disclosure of this information. Further, we note this ruling does not affect an individual’s right of access to his or her own mental health records from the professional who provided treatment under chapter 611 of the Health and Safety Code. *See* Health & Safety Code §§ 611.004, .0045; *cf. Abbott v. Tex. State Bd. of Pharmacy*, 391 S.W.3d 253 (Tex. App.—Austin 2012, no pet.) (Medical Practice Act, subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code, does not provide patient general right of access to his or her medical records from governmental body responding to a request for information under the Act).

(1978). Citing *State v. Ellefson*, 224 S.E.2d 666 (S.C. 1976) as authority, this office held that those individuals who correspond with inmates possess a “first amendment right . . . to maintain communication with [the inmate] free of the threat of public exposure;” and that this right would be violated by the release of information that identifies those correspondents, because such a release would discourage correspondence. ORD 185. The information at issue in Open Records Decision No. 185 was the identities of individuals who had corresponded with inmates, and our office found that “the public’s right to obtain an inmate’s correspondence list is not sufficient to overcome the first amendment right of the inmate’s correspondents to maintain communication with him free of the threat of public exposure.” ORD 185. Implicit in this holding is the fact that an individual’s association with an inmate may be intimate or embarrassing. In Open Records Decision Nos. 428 and 430, our office determined that inmate visitor and mail logs which identify inmates and those who choose to visit or correspond with inmates are protected by constitutional privacy because people who correspond with inmates have a First Amendment right to do so that would be threatened if their names were released. ORDs 428 and 430. Further, we recognized that inmates had a constitutional right to visit with outsiders and could also be threatened if their names were released. *See also* ORD 185. The rights of those individuals to anonymity was found to outweigh the public’s interest in this information. *Id.*; *see* ORD 430 (list of inmate visitors protected by constitutional privacy of both inmate and visitors). Upon review, we conclude the TCCO must withhold the information you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the constitutional right to privacy.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 841.0833 of the Health and Safety Code, which provides:

- (a) The office shall develop procedures for the security and monitoring of committed persons in each programming tier.
- (b) Information regarding the security and monitoring procedures developed under Subsection (a) is confidential and not subject to disclosure under [the Act].

Health & Safety Code § 841.0833. You assert the information you marked pertaining to Global Position Satellite monitoring is confidential under section 841.0833 because it “relate[s] to the security and/or monitoring and supervision of sexually violent predators[.]” However, upon review, we find you have failed to establish any of the information at issue consists of procedures for the security or monitoring of committed persons for purposes of section 841.0833. Therefore, the TCCO may not withhold any portion of the information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 841.0833 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, 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).

You state the information you marked consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations of employees of the TCCO regarding policymaking matters. Upon review, however, we find the information at issue is general administrative and purely factual that does not rise to the level of policymaking. Thus, you have failed to demonstrate the information at issue reveals advice, opinions, or recommendations that pertain to policymaking matters of the TCCO. Therefore, the TCCO may not withhold any portion of the remaining information at issue under section 552.111 of the Government Code on the basis of the deliberative process privilege.

In summary, the TCCO must withhold the information you marked and the additional information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 611.002 of the Health and Safety Code. The TCCO must withhold the information you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the constitutional right to privacy. The TCCO 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,

Blake Brennan  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

BBX/jxd

Ref: ID# 821146

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

c: 2 Third Parties  
(w/o enclosures)