



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 28, 2015

Mr. Christopher Gregg
Counsel for the City of South Houston
Gregg & Gregg, P.C.
16055 Space Center Boulevard, Suite 150
Houston, Texas 77062

OR2015-17976

Dear Mr. Gregg:

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# 577389.

The City of South Houston (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for seven categories of information pertaining to various issues, including the employment of the requestor and other named individuals. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, and 552.147 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information, portions of which constitute representative samples.²

Initially, we note the city has redacted information from the submitted documents. Pursuant to section 552.301 of the Government Code, a governmental body that seeks to withhold requested information must submit to this office a copy of the information, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the copy, unless the governmental body

¹Although you do not cite to section 552.147 of the Government Code in your brief, we understand you to raise this exception based on the substance of your arguments.

²We assume the "representative samples" of records submitted to this office are 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.

has received a previous determination for the information at issue. We understand the city has redacted information pursuant to sections 552.136(c) and 552.147(b) of the Government Code.³ You do not assert, nor does our review of our records indicate, you have been granted a previous determination to withhold the remaining redacted information without seeking a ruling from this office. *See id.* § 552.301(a); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2000). In this instance, we are able to discern the nature of the remaining information that has been redacted; thus, being deprived of that information does not inhibit our ability to make a ruling. Nevertheless, be advised that a failure to provide this office with requested information generally deprives us of the ability to determine whether information may be withheld and leaves this office with no alternative other than ordering the redacted information be released. *See Gov't Code* §§ 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body must provide this office with copy of “specific information requested”), .302. Thus, in the future, the city should refrain from redacting, without authorization, any information it submits to this office in seeking an open records ruling.

Next, we note the submitted information contains Texas Commission on Law Enforcement (“TCOLE”) personal identification numbers.⁴ Section 552.002(a) of the Government Code defines “public information” as information that is written, produced, collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business:

- (1) by a governmental body;
- (2) for a governmental body and the governmental body:
 - (A) owns the information;
 - (B) has a right of access to the information; or
 - (C) spends or contributes public money for the purpose of writing, producing, collecting, assembling, or maintaining the information; or

³Section 552.136 of the Government Code permits a governmental body to withhold the information described in section 552.136(b) without the necessity of seeking a decision from this office. *See Gov't Code* § 552.136(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.136(e). *See id.* § 552.136(d), (e). 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 id.* § 552.147(b).

⁴The Texas Commission on Law Enforcement Officer Standards and Education was renamed the Texas Commission on Law Enforcement by the 83rd Legislature. *See Act of May 6, 2013, 83rd Leg., R.S., ch. 93, § 1.01, 2013 Tex. Gen. Laws 174. 174.*

(3) by an individual officer or employee of a governmental body in the officer's or employee's official capacity and the information pertains to official business of the governmental body.

Gov't Code § 552.002(a). In Open Records Decision No. 581 (1990), this office determined certain computer information, such as source codes, documentation information, and other computer programming, that has no significance other than its use as a tool for the maintenance, manipulation, or protection of public property is not the kind of information made public under section 552.021 of the Government Code. We understand an officer's TCOLE identification number is a unique computer-generated number assigned to peace officers for identification in the commissioner's electronic database, and may be used as an access device number on the TCOLE website. Accordingly, we find the officers' TCOLE identification numbers in the submitted information do not constitute public information under section 552.002 of the Government Code. Therefore, the TCOLE identification numbers are not subject to the Act and need not be released to the requestor.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code exempts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses information other statutes make confidential. You raise section 552.101 in conjunction with the federal Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 ("HIPAA"), 42 U.S.C. §§ 1320d-1320d-8. At the direction of Congress, the Secretary of Health and Human Services ("HHS") promulgated regulations setting privacy standards for medical records, which HHS issued as the Federal Standards for Privacy of Individually Identifiable Health Information. *See* Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996, 42 U.S.C. § 1320d-2 (Supp. IV 1998) (historical & statutory note); Standards for Privacy of Individually Identifiable Health Information, 45 C.F.R. pts. 160, 164 ("Privacy Rule"); *see also* Attorney General Opinion JC-0508 at 2 (2002). These standards govern the releasability of protected health information by a covered entity. *See* 45 C.F.R. pts. 160, 164. Under these standards, a covered entity may not use or disclose protected health information, except as provided by parts 160 and 164 of the Code of Federal Regulations. *See id.* § 164.502(a).

This office addressed the interplay of the Privacy Rule and the Act in Open Records Decision No. 681 (2004). In that decision, we noted section 164.512 of title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations provides that a covered entity may use or disclose protected health information to the extent such use or disclosure is required by law and the use or disclosure complies with, and is limited to, the relevant requirements of such law. *See id.* § 164.512(a)(1). We further noted the Act "is a mandate in Texas law that compels Texas governmental bodies to disclose information to the public." *See* ORD 681 at 8; *see also* Gov't Code §§ 552.002, .003, .021. We, therefore, held the disclosures under the Act come within section 164.512(a). Consequently, the Privacy Rule does not make information confidential for the purpose of section 552.101 of the Government Code. *See Abbott v. Tex. Dep't of*

Mental Health & Mental Retardation, 212 S.W.3d 648 (Tex. App.—Austin 2006, no pet.); ORD 681 at 9; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 478 (1987) (as general rule, statutory confidentiality requires express language making information confidential). Thus, because the Privacy Rule does not make information that is subject to disclosure under the Act confidential, the city may not withhold any portion of the information at issue on this basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses chapter 411 of the Government Code, which makes confidential criminal history record information (“CHRI”) generated by the National Crime Information Center or by the Texas Crime Information Center. *See* Gov’t Code § 411.083(a). Title 28, part 20 of the Code of Federal Regulations governs the release of CHRI that states obtain from the federal government or other states. Open Records Decision No. 565 (1990). The federal regulations allow each state to follow its individual laws with respect to the CHRI it generates. *See id.* Section 411.083 of the Government Code deems confidential CHRI that the Department of Public Safety (“DPS”) maintains, except that DPS may disseminate this information as provided in chapter 411, subchapter F of the Government Code. *See* Gov’t Code § 411.083. Sections 411.083(b)(1) and 411.089(a) authorize a criminal justice agency to obtain CHRI; however, a criminal justice agency may not release CHRI except to another criminal justice agency for a criminal justice purpose. *Id.* § 411.089(b)(1). Other entities specified in chapter 411 of the Government Code are entitled to obtain CHRI from DPS or another criminal justice agency; however, those entities may not release CHRI except as provided by chapter 411. *See generally id.* §§ 411.090-.127. Thus, any CHRI obtained from DPS or any other criminal justice agency must be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with chapter 411, subchapter F of the Government Code. Upon review, we find the information in Attachment B consists of CHRI that is confidential under section 411.083. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information in Attachment B under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 411.083 of the Government Code.⁵

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 1701.306 of the Occupations Code, which pertains to L-2 Declaration of Medical Condition and L-3 Declaration of Psychological and Emotional Health forms required by TCOLE. Section 1701.306 provides the following:

(a) [TCOLE] may not issue a license to a person unless the person is examined by:

(1) a licensed psychologist or by a psychiatrist who declares in writing that the person is in satisfactory psychological and emotional health to serve as the type of officer for which a license is sought; and

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

(2) a licensed physician who declares in writing that the person does not show any trace of drug dependency or illegal drug use after a blood test or other medical test.

(b) An agency hiring a person for whom a license is sought shall select the examining physician and the examining psychologist or psychiatrist. The agency shall prepare a report of each declaration required by Subsection (a) and shall maintain a copy of the report on file in a format readily accessible to [TCOLE]. A declaration is not public information.

Occ. Code § 1701.306(a)-(b). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the L-2 forms we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1701.306 of the Occupations Code.⁶

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the Medical Practice Act (“MPA”), subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code, which governs release of medical records. *See id.* §§ 151.001-168.202. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides, in relevant part:

(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.

Id. § 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). We note some of the remaining information you seek to withhold includes the results of drug tests. Section 159.001 of the MPA defines “patient” as “a person who, to receive medical care, consults with or is seen

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

by a physician.” Occ. Code § 159.001(3). Because the individual at issue in the report did not receive medical care in the administration of the drug test, this individual is not a patient for purposes of section 159.002. Upon review, we find the information we have 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.⁷ However, we find none of the remaining information at issue constitutes a medical record subject to the MPA, and the city may not withhold any of the remaining information on that 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. This office has also found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992) (finding personal financial information to include designation of beneficiary of employee’s retirement benefits and optional insurance coverage; choice of particular insurance carrier; direct deposit authorization; and 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). We note, however, the public generally has a legitimate interest in information that relates to public employment and public employees. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 542 (1990), 470 at 4 (1987), 444 at 5-6 (1986), 432 at 2 (1984). Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). We understand you to assert portions of the remaining information are confidential under common-law privacy on the basis of Open Records Decision No. 594 (1991), in which this office concluded public employees may have a privacy interest in their drug test results. *See* ORD 594 (suggesting identification of individual as having tested positive for use of illegal drug may raise privacy issues), 455 at 5 (citing *Shoemaker v. Handel*, 619 F. Supp. 1089 (D.N.J. 1985), *aff’d*, 795 F.2d. 1136 (3rd Cir. 1986)). We note some of the information at issue pertains to the results of drug tests administered to city employees. As this office has explained on many occasions, information involving public officials and employees and public employment is generally not private because the public has a legitimate interest in such information. *See* Open Records Decision

⁷As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

Nos. 562 at 10 (1990) (personnel information does not involve most intimate aspects of human affairs, but in fact touches on matters of legitimate public concern), 473 at 3 (1987) (fact that public employee received less than perfect or even very bad evaluation not private), 470 at 4 (1987) (job performance does not generally constitute public employee's private affairs), 444 at 5 (1986) (public has legitimate interest in knowing reasons for public employee's dismissal, demotion, or promotion), 405 at 2 (1983) (manner in which public employee's job was performed cannot be said to be of minimal public interest), 329 (1982) (reasons for employee's resignation ordinarily not private).

Upon review, we find the information we have marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find the remaining information is not highly intimate or embarrassing information or is of legitimate public interest. Therefore, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

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."⁸ Gov't Code § 552.102(a). The Texas Supreme Court 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 (Tex. 2010). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the dates of birth we have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides as follows:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

...

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated

⁸The 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).

on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). A governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, orig. proceeding); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). A governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a). See ORD 551.

To establish litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office “concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture.” See Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Concrete evidence to support a claim litigation is reasonably anticipated may include, for example, the governmental body’s receipt of a letter containing a specific threat to sue the governmental body from an attorney for a potential opposing party. See Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); see also Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be “realistically contemplated”). In addition, this office has concluded litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party hired an attorney who made a demand for disputed payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, or when an individual threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney. See Open Records Decision Nos. 346 (1982), 288 (1981). In Open Records Decision No. 638 (1996), this office stated a governmental body has met its burden of showing that litigation is reasonably anticipated when it received a notice of claim letter and the governmental body represents that the notice of claim letter is in compliance with the requirements of the Texas Tort Claims Act, Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code, ch. 101. On the other hand, this office has determined if an individual publicly threatens to bring suit against a governmental body, but does not actually take objective steps toward filing suit, litigation is not reasonably anticipated. See Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982). Further, the fact that a potential opposing party has hired an attorney who makes a request for information does not establish litigation is reasonably anticipated. See Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).

You claim the city reasonably anticipates litigation with regard to the requestor because the requestor has filed complaints with the city pertaining to workplace issues. However, the submitted information does not reveal the requestor has actually threatened litigation or otherwise taken any concrete steps toward the initiation of litigation. See ORD 331. Therefore, we find you have not established the city reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the request for information. Consequently, the city may not withhold the information in Attachments C and D under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

We note some of the remaining information may be subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code. Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, emergency contact information, 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 of the Government Code. Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). 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 a current or former official or employee who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for this information was made. Accordingly, to the extent the individuals whose information we have marked timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. Conversely, to the extent the individuals at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024, the city may not withhold the marked information under section 552.117(a)(1).

Section 552.136(b) of the Government Code states “[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.” Gov't Code § 552.136(b). The city must withhold the account number we have 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). Section 552.137 does not apply to an institutional e-mail address, the general e-mail address of a business, an e-mail address of a person who has a contractual relationship with a governmental body, an e-mail address of a vendor who seeks to contract with a governmental body, an e-mail address maintained by a governmental entity for one of its officials or employees, or an e-mail address provided to a governmental body on a letterhead. *See id.* § 552.137(c). Upon review, we find the city 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.

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[.]

Id. § 2059.055(b)(1). We understand the access key we have marked can be used to gain entry to the Texas Workforce Commission's unemployment benefits database. Upon review, we find this access key, which we have marked, relates to computer network security. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.139 of the Government Code.

Section 552.147(a) of the Government Code excepts the social security number of a living individual from public disclosure. *Id.* § 552.147. Upon review, we find the city may withhold the social security numbers you indicated under section 552.147 of the Government Code.

In summary, the TCOLE identification numbers are not subject to the Act and need not be released to the requestor. The city must withhold the information in Attachment B under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 411.083 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the L-2 forms we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1701.306 of the Occupations Code. The city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the dates of birth we have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. To the extent the individuals at issue timely requested confidentiality pursuant to section 552.024, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the account number we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The city 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 city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.139 of the Government Code. The city may withhold the social security numbers you indicated under section 552.147 of the Government Code. 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 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 providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Kenny Moreland
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KJM/som

Ref: ID# 577389

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)