



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

February 1, 2010

Ms. Laura Pfefferle
Assistant General Counsel
Texas Department of State Health Services
P.O. Box 149347
Austin, Texas 78714-9347

OR2010-01529

Dear Ms. Pfefferle:

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# 368861 (DSHS File 016744-2010).

The Texas Department of State Health Services (the "department") received a request for the following information: (1) records relating to any alleged violations of the Texas Mold Assessment and Remediation Rules that occurred during a specified time period; (2) communications discussing the impact and effect of the Governor's Emergency Proclamation of September 8, 2008 on the department; and (3) internal memoranda regarding the impact of any Governor's Emergency Proclamation on the department's rules. You state you will release some information to the requestor. You claim the remaining requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.107, 552.111, and 552.137 of the

Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides in part:

(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 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 sufficient to establish the applicability of section 552.103 to the information that it seeks to withhold. To meet this burden, the governmental body must demonstrate that (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date of its receipt of the request for information and (2) the information at issue is related to the pending or anticipated litigation. *See Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, no pet.); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.). Both elements of the test must be met in order for information to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.103. *See Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990).*

¹Although the department also raises section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with Rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence and rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure, this office has concluded that section 552.101 does not encompass discovery privileges. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 1-2 (2002), 575 at 2 (1990).* Thus, we will not address the department's claim that portions of the submitted information are confidential under section 552.101 in conjunction with either of these rules. We note that the proper exceptions to raise when asserting the attorney-client privilege and the attorney work product privilege in this instance are sections 552.107 and 552.111 of the Government Code, respectively. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 677 (2002), 676 at 6.*

²We 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.

To establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated for purposes of section 552.103, a governmental body must provide this office with "concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture." *See* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). In the context of anticipated litigation in which the governmental body is the prospective plaintiff, the concrete evidence must at least reflect that litigation is "realistically contemplated." *See* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989); *see also* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982) (finding that investigatory file may be withheld if governmental body attorney determines that it should be withheld pursuant to section 552.103 and that litigation is "reasonably likely to result"). The question of whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See* ORD 452 at 4.

You state the information you have marked pertains to a Notice of Violation that the department issued prior to its receipt of the present request for information regarding alleged violations of chapter 295 of title 25 of the Texas Administrative Code. You explain the department reasonably anticipates litigation because section 1958.254 of the Occupations Code provides that a person charged with a violation may request a hearing under the contested case provisions of chapter 2001 of the Government Code. We note such contested cases conducted under the Administrative Procedure Act, chapter 2001 of the Government Code, are considered litigation for purposes of section 552.103. *See* Open Records Decision No. 588 at 7 (1991). You also indicate the information at issue relates to the anticipated litigation. Upon review, we find the information at issue is related to the anticipated litigation. Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we find that the department may withhold the information it has marked under section 552.103 of the Government Code.³

We note once the information has been obtained by all parties to the litigation through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information either obtained from or provided to the opposing parties in the anticipated litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a), and must be disclosed. Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded or is no longer reasonably anticipated. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

Next, you seek to withhold some of the remaining information under section 552.107 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

³As we are able to make this determination, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

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 “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 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). 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 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 pet.). 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 e-mail communications you have marked in the remaining information were made between department attorneys and department staff in connection with the rendition of professional legal services to the department. You state the communications were intended to remain confidential and the confidentiality of the communications has been maintained. Based on your representations and our review, we find the department has established the applicability of section 552.107(1) to the information at issue. Therefore, the department may generally withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107 of the Government Code. However, we note some of the individual e-mails in the submitted e-mail chains consist of communications with the requestor. Thus, to the extent these non-privileged e-mails, which we have marked, exist separate and apart from the submitted e-mail chains, they may not be withheld under section 552.107.

You assert portions of the remaining information are excepted from public disclosure based on the attorney work product privilege. Section 552.111 of the Government Code 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 351, 360 (Tex. 2000); 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 that 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 that the information was made or developed in anticipation of litigation, we must be satisfied that:

(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 state the information at issue was prepared and developed by the department attorneys and department staff with regard to anticipated litigation regarding the department's issuance of a Notice of Violation regarding alleged violations of chapter 295 of title 25 of the Texas Administrative Code. Upon review, however, we find you have failed to demonstrate the information at issue consists of material prepared or mental impressions developed in anticipation of litigation or for trial by a party or a representative of a party. Accordingly, the department may not withhold any of the information at issue under the work product privilege of section 552.111.

You also argue portions of the remaining information are excepted from disclosure under the deliberative privilege process encompassed by section 552.111 of the Government Code, which 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. 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, 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 that 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. *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).

This office has also concluded that a preliminary draft of a document that is 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 at 9.

You state that the information at issue consists of the advice, opinions, and recommendations of department employees involving department policymaking matters. Upon review of your representations and the information at issue, we agree that some of the information at issue, which we have marked, consists of the advice, opinions, or recommendations of department employees regarding policymaking matters. However, you have failed to establish that the remaining information, which consists of general factual and administrative information, consists of advice, opinions, or recommendations for purposes of section 552.111. Therefore, the deliberative process privilege section of 552.111 is not applicable to the remaining information at issue. Accordingly, the department may only withhold the information we have marked under the deliberative process privilege of section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Next, you claim some of the remaining information is excepted from disclosure under 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)*. We note that section 552.137 is not applicable to an e-mail address that a governmental entity maintains for one of its officials or employees. You state the owner of the e-mail addresses at issue have not consented to release of this information. Therefore, except for the information we have marked for release, the department must withhold the e-mail addresses you have marked, and the additional e-mail address we have marked, under section 552.137 of the Government Code.⁴

In summary, the department may withhold the information you have marked pursuant to section 552.103 of the Government Code. The department may generally withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107 of the Government Code. However, to the extent the e-mails we have marked exist separate and apart from the e-mail chains, these non-privileged e-mails must be released. The department may withhold the information we have marked under the deliberative process privilege of section 552.111 of the Government Code. Except for the information we have marked for release, the department must withhold the e-mail addresses you have marked, and the additional e-mail address we have marked, under section 552.137 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released to the requestor.

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.

⁴We note this office recently issued Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009), a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold ten categories of information, including an e-mail address of a member of the public under section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

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,



Amy L.S. Shipp
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

ALS/rl

Ref: ID# 368861

Enc. Submitted documents

cc: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)