



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

December 18, 2012

Mr. C. David Richards, III
Assistant General Counsel
Texas Department State Health Services
P.O. Box 149347
Austin, Texas 78714-9347

OR2012-20403

Dear Mr. Richards:

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# 474176 (DSHS File 20879/2012).

The Texas Department of State Health Services (the "department") received a request for information pertaining to the State Committee of Examiners in the Fitting and Dispensing of Hearing Instruments (the "committee") and two named companies during a specified time period. You state the department has made or will make some information available to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, 552.111, and 552.137 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

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 confidentiality provisions such as section 402.154 of the Occupations Code, which provides:

(h) All information and materials subpoenaed or compiled by the [State Committee of Examiners in the Fitting and Dispensing of Hearing Instruments (the "committee")] in connection with a complaint and

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 committee or its agents or employees who are involved in discipline of the holder of a license, except that this information may be disclosed to:

- (1) persons involved with the committee in a disciplinary action against the holder of a license;
- (2) professional licensing or disciplinary boards for the fitting and dispensing of hearing instruments in other jurisdictions;
- (3) peer assistance programs approved by the board under Chapter 467, Health and Safety Code;
- (4) law enforcement agencies; and
- (5) persons engaged in bona fide research, if all individual-identifying information has been deleted.

(i) The filing of formal charges by the committee against a holder of a license, the nature of those charges, disciplinary proceedings of the committee, and final disciplinary actions, including warnings and reprimands, by the committee are not confidential and are subject to disclosure in accordance with [the Act].

Occ. Code § 402.154(h), (i). You state the submitted documents in Exhibit B were gathered or created by the committee in response to a complaint and related investigation. You further state none of the exceptions to confidentiality under section 402.154(h) are applicable in this instance and indicate none of the submitted information is subject to release under section 402.154(i). Based on your representations and our review, we conclude that Exhibit B is made confidential in its entirety pursuant to section 402.154(h) of the Occupations Code. The department must, therefore, withhold Exhibit B pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code.

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 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 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.* 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, 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 state the information in Exhibit C consists of confidential communications made in furtherance of professional legal services rendered to the department. You state these communications are between the attorneys and staff within the department’s Professional Licensing and Certification Unit (the “PLCU”), as the administrative agent for the committee. You further inform this office these communications have not been shared outside the department. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue in Exhibit C. Accordingly, the department may withhold Exhibit C under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.111 of the Government Code 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.” Gov’t Code § 552.111. Section 552.111 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, no writ); 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 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. *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.

You assert the information in Exhibit D consists of communications between employees and attorneys for the department, the committee, and the PLCU. You state the information at issue pertains to internal discussions, opinions, and recommendations including the decision-making process arising out of the investigation at issue. Based on your representations and our review, we find the department has demonstrated portions of the information at issue, which we have marked, consist of advice, opinions, or recommendations on the policymaking matters of the department. Thus, the department may withhold the marked information under section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, we find the

remaining information at issue is general administrative and purely factual information or has been shared with an individual with whom you have not demonstrated the department shares a privity of interest or common deliberative process. Thus, we find you have failed to show how the remaining information at issue consists of advice, opinions, or recommendations on the policymaking matters of the department. Accordingly, the remaining information at issue may not be withheld under the deliberative process privilege of section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Section 552.111 of the Government Code also encompasses the attorney work product privilege found in rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. *City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d at 360; Open Records Decision No. 677 at 4-8 (2002). Rule 192.5 defines work product as

(1) material prepared or mental impressions developed in anticipation of litigation or for trial by or for a party or a party's representatives, including the party's attorneys, consultants, sureties, indemnitors, insurers, employees, or agents; or

(2) a communication made in anticipation of litigation or for trial between a party and the party's representatives or among a party's representatives, including the party's attorneys, consultants, sureties, indemnitors, insurers, employees or agents.

TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5. A governmental body seeking to withhold information under this exception bears the burden of demonstrating the information was created or developed for trial or in anticipation of litigation by or for a party or a party's representative. TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5; ORD 677 at 6-8. In order for this office to conclude the information was made or developed in anticipation of litigation, we must be satisfied

a) a reasonable person would have concluded from the totality of the circumstances surrounding the investigation that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue; and b) the party resisting discovery believed in good faith that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue and [created or obtained the information] for the purpose of preparing for such litigation.

Nat'l Tank Co. v. Brotherton, 851 S.W.2d 193, 207 (Tex. 1993). A "substantial chance" of litigation does not mean a statistical probability, but rather "that litigation is more than merely an abstract possibility or unwarranted fear." *Id.* at 204; ORD 677 at 7.

You generally claim the attorney work product privilege of section 552.111 of the Government Code for the remaining information in Exhibit D. However, we find you have

not demonstrated the information at issue consists of mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of a party or party's representative prepared in anticipation of litigation or for trial. Therefore, we find the department has failed to demonstrate the applicability of the work product privilege to the information at issue, and the department may not withhold any of the information at issue under the work product privilege of section 552.111 of the Government Code.

The remaining information in Exhibit D contains e-mail addresses that are subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code. Section 552.137 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* Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail addresses at issue are not excluded by subsection (c). Therefore, the department 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.

In summary, the department must withhold Exhibit B under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 402.154(h) of the Occupations Code. The department may withhold Exhibit C under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The department may withhold the information we have marked in Exhibit D under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The department must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code unless the owners affirmatively consent to release. The department must release the remaining information.

You also ask this office to issue a previous determination permitting the department to withhold information subject to section 402.154(h) of the Occupations Code without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office. *See id.* § 552.301(a) (allowing governmental body to withhold information subject to previous determination); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001). After due consideration, we have decided to grant your request. Therefore, this letter ruling shall serve as a previous determination under section 552.301(a) for information held by the department that is made confidential under section 402.154(h) of the Occupations Code and must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis. We note that you must only withhold this type of information when none of the exceptions to confidentiality under section 402.154(h) apply. Furthermore, in accordance with section 402.154(i) of the Occupations Code, the department may not withhold the nature of any charges filed, disciplinary proceedings of the committee, or any final disciplinary actions. So long as the elements of law, fact, and circumstances do not change so as to no longer support the findings set forth above, the department need not ask for a decision from this office again with respect to this type of information. *See* ORD 673 at 7.

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.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php, 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 must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General, toll free at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Cynthia G. Tynan
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CGT/akg

Ref: ID# 474176

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)