



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 26, 2016

Mr. Jonathan Miles
Open Records Attorney
Texas Health and Human Services Commission
P.O. Box 13247
Austin, Texas 78711

OR2016-12080

Dear Mr. Miles:

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# 611736.

The Texas Health and Human Services Commission (the "commission") received a request for any contract compliance investigations, audits, or reviews conducted on the Texas Children's Health Insurance Plan ("CHIP"), and all internal correspondence between any commission employees during a specified time period.¹ You state the commission is releasing some of the requested information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, 552.111, and 552.116 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.² We have also received and considered

¹You state the commission sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also* *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or overbroad request for information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

²We assume 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 those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

comments from the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

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 (“OIG”)] in connection with an audit 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 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.

Id. § 531.1021(g), (h). You state some of the submitted information, which you have marked, was compiled by the OIG in connection with an audit or investigation concerning alleged Medicaid and other health and human services fraud and abuse. Based on your representation and our review, we find the commission must withhold the information you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 531.1021(g) of the Government Code.³

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses sections 12.003 and 21.012 of the Human Resources Code. Section 12.003 of the Human Resources Code provides in relevant part:

(a) Except for purposes directly connected with the administration of the [commission's]⁴ assistance programs, it is an offense for a person to solicit, disclose, receive, or make use of, or to authorize, knowingly permit, participate in, or acquiesce in the use of the names of, or any information

³As our ruling is dispositive for this information, we do not address your argument under section 552.116 of the Government Code against its disclosure.

⁴*See* Act of June 10, 2003, 78th Leg., R.S., ch. 198, 2003 Tex. Gen. Laws 611, 641 (abolished Texas Department of Human Services).

concerning, persons applying for or receiving assistance if the information is directly or indirectly derived from the records, papers, files, or communications of the [commission] or acquired by employees of the [commission] in the performance of their official duties.

Hum. Res. Code § 12.003(a) (footnote added); *see also id.* § 21.012 (requiring provision of safeguards that restrict use or disclosure of information concerning applicants for or recipients of assistance programs to purposes directly connected with administration of programs). The term “assistance” in sections 12.003 and 21.012 includes “all forms of assistance and services for needy persons authorized by Subtitle C” of title 2 of the Human Resources Code. *Id.* § 11.001(4); *see also id.* §§ 31.001 *et seq.* (Hum. Res. Code title 2, subtitle C, Assistance Programs).

In Open Records Decision No. 584 (1991), this office concluded “[t]he inclusion of the words ‘or any information’ juxtaposed with the prohibition on disclosure of the names of [the commission’s] clients clearly expresses a legislative intent to encompass the broadest range of individual client information, and not merely the clients’ names and addresses.” Open Records Decision No. 584 at 3 (1991). Consequently, it is the specific information pertaining to individual clients, and not merely the clients’ identities, that is made confidential under section 12.003. *See also* 42 U.S.C. § 1396a(a)(7) (state plan for medical assistance must provide safeguards that restrict use or disclosure of information concerning applicants and recipients to purposes directly connected with administration of plan); 42 C.F.R. §§ 431.300 *et seq.*; Open Records Decision No. 166 (1977).

You assert some of the remaining information, which you have marked, relates to recipients of benefits from Medicaid and the CHIP program, which are assistance programs administered by the commission. You inform us the release of this information in this instance would not be for purposes directly connected with the administration of an assistance program. Based on your representations and our review, we conclude the commission must withhold the information you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 12.003 of the Human Resources Code.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.107(1). 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 “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 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: (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. *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 some of the remaining information, which you have marked, consists of communications involving attorneys for the commission and commission employees and officials in their capacities as clients. You state these communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the commission. You state these communications were intended to be, and have remained, confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Accordingly, the commission may withhold the information you marked 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 that are 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).

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 contend some of the remaining information, which you have marked, contains advice, opinion, and recommendations concerning policy matters within the commission. The information at issue consists of evaluation forms, an evaluation plan, work papers, committee notes, tabulations, and committee members' individual notes. Upon review, however, we find the information at issue is general administrative and purely factual information, and you have not demonstrated any portion of the information consists of internal communications consisting of advice, opinion, and recommendation pertaining to policymaking. Further, some of the information appears to have been received from individuals or entities you have not identified, and thus with whom you have not demonstrated the commission shares a privity of interest or common deliberative process. Thus, we find you have failed to show the information at issue consists of internal communications containing advice, opinions, or recommendations on the policymaking matters of the commission. Accordingly, the commission may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

In summary, the commission must withhold the information you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 531.1021(g) of the Government Code and the information you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 12.003 of the Human Resources Code. The commission

may withhold the information you marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The commission 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,



Claire V. Morris Sloan
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CVMS/som

Ref: ID# 611736

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)