



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 17, 2017

Mr. Carey E. Smith
Senior Counsel
Texas Health and Human Services Commission
P.O. Box 13247
Austin, Texas 78711-3247

OR2017-23789

Dear Mr. Smith:

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# 680685 (Ref. No. 13233).

The Texas Health and Human Services Commission (the "commission") received a request for information pertaining to a specified contract involving the requestor's client. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, 552.108, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

Initially, we note some of the submitted information is not responsive to the present request because it was created after the date of the present request. This ruling does not address the public availability of the non-responsive information, which we have marked, and the commission need not release it in response to this request.

Next, we must address the obligations of the commission under section 552.301 of the Government Code, which prescribes the procedures a governmental body must follow in

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). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

asking this office to decide whether requested information is excepted from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301. Section 552.301(e-1) provides the following:

A governmental body that submits written comments to the attorney general under Subsection (e)(1)(A) shall send a copy of those comments to the person who requested the information from the governmental body not later than the 15th business day after the date of receiving the written request. If the written comments disclose or contain the substance of the information requested, the copy of the comments provided to the person must be a redacted copy.

See id. § 552.301(e-1). We note that although the commission copied the requestor on the brief to our office, the commission provided an additional brief with arguments for sections 552.101, 552.103, and 552.108, which was not sent to the requestor. We further note portions of the commission's additional brief to this office neither disclose nor contain the substance of the information at issue. Based on our review of the information at issue, we find the commission did not provide the requestor with a copy of its argument for sections 552.101, 552.103, or 552.108. Accordingly, we conclude the commission failed to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301(e-1) of the Government Code with respect to sections 552.101, 552.103, and section 552.108.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless there is a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ). Because section 552.101 can provide a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness, we will address your argument under this section for the submitted information. However, we find you have failed to establish a compelling reason to address section 552.103 or 552.108. Accordingly, no portion of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.103 or 552.108 of the Government Code. However, we will consider the remaining arguments for which the commission satisfied the procedural requirements of section 552.301(e-1).

Next, we note some of the submitted responsive information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides, in relevant part:

(a) [T]he following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

- (1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). Some of the submitted responsive information consists of a completed investigation subject to section 552.022(a)(1). The commission must release the completed investigation pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1) unless it is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or expressly made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* Although you raise sections 552.107 and 552.111 of the Government Code for the completed investigation, these sections are discretionary exceptions to disclosure and do not make information confidential under the Act. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 10-11 (2002) (attorney-client privilege under section 552.107(1) may be waived), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions), 470 at 7 (1987) (deliberative process privilege under statutory predecessor to section 552.111 subject to waiver). Therefore, none of the information at issue, which we have marked, may be withheld under section 552.107 or section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, the Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Evidence are "other law" that make information expressly confidential for the purposes of section 552.022. *In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). Thus, we will consider your assertion of the attorney-client privilege under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 for the information subject to section 552.022. Further, because section 552.101 of the Government Code makes information confidential under the Act, we will address its applicability to the information at issue. We will also consider your arguments under sections 552.107 and 552.111 for the information not subject to section 552.022.

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 encompasses information protected by other statutes, including section 531.1021 of the Government Code, which provides, in relevant part:

(g) All information and materials subpoenaed or compiled by the [commission's Office of the Inspector General (the "OIG")] in connection with an audit, inspection, or investigation or by the office of the attorney general in connection with a Medicaid fraud investigation are confidential and not subject to disclosure under [the Act], and not subject to disclosure, discovery, subpoena, or other means of legal compulsion for their release to anyone other than the [OIG] or the attorney general or their employees or agents involved in the audit, inspection, or investigation conducted by the [OIG] or the attorney general, except that this information may be disclosed to the state auditor's office, law enforcement agencies, and other entities as permitted by other law.

(h) A person who receives information under Subsection (g) may disclose the information only in accordance with Subsection (g) and in a manner that is consistent with the authorized purpose for which the person first received the information.

Act of May 19, 2017, 85th Leg., R.S., H.B. 2379, § 2 (to be codified at Gov't Code § 531.1021(g)); Gov't Code § 531.1021(h). You state, and the information at issue reflects, some of the submitted responsive information was compiled by the OIG in connection with an investigation concerning alleged health and human services fraud and abuse. Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we find the commission must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 531.1021(g) of the Government Code.²

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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate 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 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: (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. *See 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 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).

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

You state the remaining responsive information consists of communications between commission attorneys and employees that were made for the purpose of providing legal services to the commission. 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 have marked consists of privileged attorney-client communications. Therefore, the commission may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.³ However, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information constitutes privileged attorney-client communications for the purposes of section 552.107(1). Accordingly, the commission may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.107(1) of the Government 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 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).

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

This office has also concluded a preliminary draft of a document intended for public release in its final form necessarily represents the drafter's advice, opinion, and recommendation with regard to the form and content of the final document, so as to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.111. *See* Open Records Decision No. 559 at 2 (1990) (applying statutory predecessor). Section 552.111 protects factual information in the draft that also will be included in the final version of the document. *See id.* at 2-3. Thus, section 552.111 encompasses the entire contents, including comments, underlining, deletions, and proofreading marks, of a preliminary draft of a policymaking document that will be released to the public in its final form. *See id.* at 2.

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.

You state the remaining information consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations of commission employees and officials regarding policymaking matters. Upon review, we find the commission may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, the remaining information was shared with third parties with whom you have not demonstrated a privity of interest. Therefore, we find the commission has failed to demonstrate the remaining information constitutes internal communications containing advice, recommendations, or opinions reflecting the policymaking processes of the commission. Accordingly, the commission may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.111 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).⁴ Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail addresses at issue are not a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c) of the Government Code. Accordingly, the commission must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners of the e-mail address affirmatively consent to disclosure.

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

In summary, the commission must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 531.1021(g) of the Government Code. The commission may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The commission may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The commission must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners of the e-mail address affirmatively consent to disclosure. The commission must release the remaining responsive 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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Meredith L. Coffman', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Meredith L. Coffman
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MLC/tdw

Ref: ID# 680685

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)