



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 15, 2020

Mr. Matt Shovlin
Assistant District Attorney
County of Denton
P.O. Box 2344
Denton, Texas 76202

OR2020-17638

Dear Mr. Shovlin:

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# 835952 (PIR# 20-152).

The County of Denton (the "county") received a request for e-mails sent to or from two named individuals containing certain words during a specified time period. You state you released some information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

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 information made confidential by other statutes, such as section 81.046 of the Health and Safety Code, which provides, in part:

¹ Although the county raises Texas Rule of Evidence 503, we note the proper exception to raise when asserting the attorney-client privilege for information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code is section 552.107 of the Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 1-2 (2002).

² 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.

(a) Reports, records, and information received from any source, including from a federal agency or from another state, furnished to a public health district, a health authority, a local health department, or the [Texas Department of State Health Services] that relate to cases or suspected cases of diseases or health conditions are confidential and may be used only for the purposes of this chapter.

(b) Reports, records, and information relating to cases or suspected cases of diseases or health conditions are not public information under [the Act], and may not be released or made public on subpoena or otherwise except as provided by Subsections (c), (c-1), (d), and (f).

Health & Safety Code § 81.046(a)-(b). In Open Records Decision No. 577 (1990), this office concluded that any information acquired or created during an investigation under chapter 81 of the Health and Safety Code is confidential and may not be released unless an exception set out in the statute applies. *See id.* § 81.046(b)-(d), (f); ORD 577. You state the submitted information relates to cases or suspected cases of contagious diseases; thus, section 81.046 governs the release of the information at issue. Based on your representations and our review, we agree section 81.046 governs the release of the information at issue. We understand none of the release provisions of section 81.046 are applicable in this instance. Accordingly, with the exception of the information we indicated, the county must withhold the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 81.046 of the Health and Safety Code.³ Upon review, however, we find none of the remaining information consists of reports, records, or information that relates to cases or suspected cases of diseases or health conditions for purposes of section 81.046. Accordingly, the county may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 81.046 of the Health and Safety Code.

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. ORD 676 at 6-7. 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

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

element. Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). 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.*, 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 argue some of the remaining information constitutes communications between county attorneys, county employees in their capacity as clients, and other privileged parties that were made for the purpose of providing legal services to the county. You state the communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find the information we indicated consists of privileged attorney-client communications and the county may withhold this information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.⁴

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information protected by other statutes, including section 161.0213 of the Health and Safety Code. Section 161.0213 provides as follows:

Reports, records, and information furnished to the commissioner [of public health] or the commissioner’s designee or the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality that relate to an epidemiologic or toxicologic investigation of human illnesses or conditions and of environmental exposures that are harmful or believed to be harmful to the public health are not public information under Chapter 552, Government Code, and are subject to the same confidentiality requirements as described by Section 81.046.

Health and Safety Code § 161.0213. Upon review, we find the county has failed to establish any portion of the remaining information is confidential under section 161.0213 of the Health and Safety Code. Accordingly, the county may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that ground.

⁴ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information made confidential by section 181.006 of the Health and Safety Code. Section 181.006 states that:

For a covered entity that is a governmental unit, an individual's protected health information:

(1) includes any information that reflects that an individual received health care from the covered entity; and

(2) is not public information and is not subject to disclosure under [the Act].

Id. § 181.006. Section 181.001(b)(2) defines "[c]overed entity," in part, as any person who:

(A) for commercial, financial, or professional gain, monetary fees, or dues, or on a cooperative, nonprofit, or pro bono basis, engages, in whole or in part, and with real or constructive knowledge, in the practice of assembling, collecting, analyzing, using, evaluating, storing, or transmitting protected health information. The term includes a business associate, health care payer, governmental unit, information or computer management entity, school, health researcher, health care facility, clinic, health care provider, or person who maintains an Internet site[.]

Id. § 181.001(b)(2)(A). You do not inform us the county is a covered entity for purposes of section 181.006 of the Health and Safety Code. Thus, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information is subject to section 181.006 of the Health and Safety Code, and the county may not withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code on this 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. Upon review, we find the county has failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Thus, the county may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.111 of the Government Code exempts 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).

Section 552.111 can also encompass communications between a governmental body and a third party, including a consultant or other party with a privity of interest. See Open Records Decision No. 561 at 9 (1990) (section 552.111 encompasses communications with party with which governmental body has privity of interest or common deliberative process). For section 552.111 to apply, the governmental body must identify the third party and explain the nature of its relationship with the governmental body. Section 552.111 is not applicable to a communication between the governmental body and a third party unless the governmental body establishes it has a privity of interest or common deliberative process with the third party. See ORD 561.

Upon review, we find the remaining information is either factual in nature or consists of administrative matters that do not rise to the level of policymaking. Therefore, we find the county has failed to demonstrate the remaining responsive information constitutes internal communications containing advice, recommendations, or opinions reflecting the policymaking processes of the county. Accordingly, the county may not withhold any of the remaining responsive information under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

In summary, with the exception of the information we marked and indicated, the county must withhold the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 81.046 of the Health and Safety Code. The county may withhold the information we indicated under section 552.107 of the Government Code. The county must release the remaining information, which we marked.

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,

Michelle Garza
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MRG/jlbm

Ref: ID# 835952

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)