



OFFICE of the ATTORNEY GENERAL
GREG ABBOTT

February 20, 2003

Mr. Bill Ainsworth
Assistant City Attorney
City of Corpus Christi
P.O. Box 9277
Corpus Christi, Texas 78469-9277

OR2003-1121

Dear Mr. Ainsworth:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 176769.

The City of Corpus Christi (the "city") received two requests for all e-mails and attachments sent or received by Dr. Ardys Grosjean Boostrom ("Boostrom") and Annette Rodriguez ("Rodriguez") for a specified time period. You state that you will release most of the responsive information to the requestor. However, you claim that a portion of the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, 552.111, 552.117, 552.136, and 552.137 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrines of common-law and constitutional privacy. For information to be protected from public disclosure under common-law privacy, the information must meet the criteria set out in *Industrial Foundation v. Texas Industrial Accident Board*, 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976), *cert. denied*, 430 U.S. 931 (1977). Information may be withheld from the public when (1) it is highly intimate and embarrassing such that its release would be highly objectionable to a person of ordinary sensibilities, and (2) there is no legitimate public interest in its disclosure. *Id.* at 685; Open Records Decision No. 611 at 1 (1992). The type of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*

¹We assume that 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). Here, we do not address any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. *Id.* at 683. Additionally, this office has determined that common-law privacy also protects certain other types of medical information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 659 at 4-5 (1999) (summarizing medical and other types of information that attorney general has determined to be private). You assert that the information in Boostrom Exhibit C and Rodriguez Exhibit D is protected by common-law privacy. Having reviewed these exhibits, we agree that some of the information is highly intimate or embarrassing and is not of legitimate concern to the public. Therefore, this information, which we have marked, is protected by common-law privacy and must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code. However, we conclude that the remainder of the information in these exhibits is not highly intimate or embarrassing. Therefore, this information is not protected by common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 also encompasses constitutional rights of privacy. Constitutional privacy protects two kinds of interests. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 3-5 (1992), 478 at 4 (1987), 455 at 3-7 (1987); *see also Whalen v. Roe*, 429 U.S. 589, 599-600 (1977). 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* Open Records Decision No. 455 at 3-7 (1987); *see also Fadjo v. Coon*, 633 F.2d 1172 (5th Cir. 1981). The second constitutionally protected privacy interest is in freedom from public disclosure of certain personal matters. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 at 6-7 (1987); *see also Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Tex.*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985), *reh’g denied*, 770 F.2d 1081 (1985), *cert. denied*, 474 U.S. 1062 (1986). Constitutional privacy is reserved for “the most intimate aspects of human affairs.” Open Records Decision No. 455 at 8 (1987) (quoting *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village*, 765 F.2d at 492). You assert that the information in Rodriguez Exhibit D is protected by constitutional privacy. Upon review of the submitted information, we conclude that none of this information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 in conjunction with constitutional privacy.

Further, you assert that Rodríguez Exhibit D is excepted from disclosure based on section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with “whistleblower protection.” Section 552.101 also encompasses information protected by other statutes. However, the Texas Whistleblower Act, Gov’t Code §§ 554.001-.010, does not contain a confidentiality provision that makes the submitted information confidential for the purpose of the Public Information Act. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 478 at 2 (1987) (language of confidentiality statute controls scope of protection), 465 at 4-5 (1987) (statute explicitly required confidentiality); *see also* Gov’t Code §§ 554.001-010. Therefore, Rodriguez Exhibit D may not be withheld under section 552.101 and the Texas Whistleblower Act.

Additionally, you claim that Rodriguez Exhibit D contains medical records, access to which is governed by the Medical Practice Act (“MPA”), chapter 159 of the Occupations Code. Section 159.002 provides in pertinent part:

(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(b), (c). The MPA requires that any subsequent release of medical records be consistent with the purposes for which a governmental body obtained the records. Open Records Decision No. 565 at 7 (1990). Thus, the MPA governs access to medical records. Open Records Decision No. 598 (1991). Moreover, information that is subject to the MPA includes both medical records and information obtained from those medical records. *See* Occ. Code § 159.002(a), (b), (c); Open Records Decision No. 598 (1991). Based on our review of Rodriguez Exhibit D, we conclude that none of these documents are subject to the MPA. Therefore, the MPA is inapplicable to Rodriguez Exhibit D.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within 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 “for the purpose of facilitating 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 Texas 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 to whom disclosure is made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client or those reasonably necessary for the transmission of 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, no writ). 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 represent that the documents in Boostrom Exhibit B and Rodriguez Exhibit B consist of: 1) communications of legal advice or opinion from city attorneys to city staff; 2) communications from city staff to city attorneys seeking legal advice; or 3) summaries of legal advice provided to city staff by city attorneys. Based on your arguments and our review of this information, we find that you have demonstrated that this information is protected by the attorney-client privilege and is therefore excepted from disclosure under section 552.107.

In regard to Boostrom Exhibit D and Rodriguez Exhibit E, you assert section 552.111 of the Government Code. Section 552.111 excepts from disclosure “an interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency.” In Open Records Decision No. 615 (1993), this office reexamined the predecessor to the section 552.111 exception in light of the decision in *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ), and held that section 552.111 excepts only those internal communications consisting of advice, recommendations, opinions, and other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the governmental body. *City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351, 364 (Tex. 2000); *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Texas Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.). An agency’s policymaking functions do not encompass internal administrative or personnel matters; disclosure of information relating to such matters will not inhibit free discussion among agency personnel as to policy issues. ORD 615 at 5-6. Additionally, section 552.111 does not generally except from disclosure purely factual information that is severable from the opinion portions of internal memoranda. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 37 S.W.3d at 160; ORD 615 at 4-5. The preliminary draft of a policymaking document that has been released or is intended for release in final form is excepted from disclosure in its entirety under section 552.111 because such a draft necessarily represents the advice, recommendations, or opinions of the drafter as to the form and content of the final document. Open Records Decision No. 559 at 2 (1990). Having reviewed the information at issue, we conclude that Boostrom Exhibit D and Rodriguez Exhibit E consist of advice, opinions, recommendations, or other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the governmental body. Therefore, you may withhold this information under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

You raise section 552.117 of the Government Code in regard to the information in Boostrom Exhibit E. Section 552.117 excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024. Whether a particular piece of information is protected by section 552.117 must be determined at the time the request for it is made. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Therefore, the city may only withhold information under section 552.117 on behalf of current or former officials or employees who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for this information was made. For those employees who timely elected to keep their personal information confidential, you must withhold the employees' home addresses and telephone numbers, social security numbers, and any family member information. The city may not withhold this information under section 552.117 for those employees who did not make a timely election to keep the information confidential.

We note, however, that an employee's social security number may nevertheless be confidential under federal law. A social security number may be withheld in some circumstances under section 552.101 in conjunction with the 1990 amendments to the federal Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I). *See* Open Records Decision No. 622 (1994). These amendments make confidential social security numbers and related records that are obtained and maintained by a state agency or political subdivision of the state pursuant to any provision of law enacted on or after October 1, 1990. *See id.* We have no basis for concluding that the social security number in the responsive information is confidential under section 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I), and therefore excepted from public disclosure under section 552.101 of the Act on the basis of that federal provision. We caution, however, that section 552.352 of the Act imposes criminal penalties for the release of confidential information. Prior to releasing any social security number information, the city should ensure that no such information was obtained or is maintained by the city pursuant to any provision of law enacted on or after October 1, 1990.

Finally, in regard to Boostrom Exhibit F and Rodriguez Exhibit C, you raise section 552.137 of the Government Code.² These exhibits contain e-mail addresses obtained from the public that are excepted from public disclosure. Section 552.137 makes certain e-mail addresses confidential and provides in relevant part:

- (a) An e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body is confidential and not subject to disclosure under this chapter.

²We note that section 552.137 of the Government Code is identical to section 552.136.

(b) Confidential information described by this section that relates to a member of the public may be disclosed if the member of the public affirmatively consents to its release.

Section 552.137 does not apply to a government employee's work e-mail address or a business's general e-mail address or web address. Accordingly, unless consent to release has been granted, the city must withhold the applicable e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code. We have marked a representative sample of applicable e-mail addresses.

In summary, we conclude that: 1) you must withhold the information we have marked in Boostrom Exhibit C and Rodriguez Exhibit D under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy; 2) you may withhold Boostrom Exhibit B and Rodriguez Exhibit B pursuant to section 552.107 of the Government Code; 3) you may withhold Boostrom Exhibit D and Rodriguez Exhibit E under section 552.111 of the Government Code; 4) for those employees that made a timely election, you must withhold their section 552.117 information; 5) the social security number may be confidential under section 552.101 in conjunction with federal law; and 6) unless consent to release has been granted, you must withhold e-mail addresses of members of the public under section 552.137 of the Government Code. All remaining information must be released.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body

fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.--Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



W. Montgomery Meitler
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

WMM/lmt

Ref: ID# 176769

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Mr. Douglas C. Crumly
D.C. Investigations
P.O. Box 38
Chapman Ranch, Texas 78347
(w/o enclosures)