



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

June 14, 2004

Ms. Carol Longoria
Public Information Coordinator
The University of Texas System
201 West Seventh Street
Austin, Texas 78701-2902

OR2004-4822

Dear Ms. Longoria:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 203145.

The University of Texas at Austin (the "university") received a request for several categories of information pertaining to the use of racial or ethnic classifications by the university in the admissions process or other programs. You advise that the university requested clarification of the request from the requestor, and you have submitted copies of the requestor's written responses. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing that a governmental body may ask the requestor to clarify the request if what information is requested is unclear to the governmental body); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 663 at 5 (1999) (discussing requests for clarification). You state that the university believes that documents reflecting the university's current policy review, undertaken in light of recent decisions of the United States Supreme Court allowing the consideration of race in admissions, are responsive to the request. *See Gratz v. Bollinger*, 539 U.S. 244 (2003), *Grutter v. Bollinger* 539 U.S. 306 (2003) (upholding consideration of race as factor in admissions, in cases challenging use of affirmative action at University of Michigan). You indicate that some responsive information will be released to the requestor. You contend, however, that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

¹ We 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.

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.” In Open Records Decision No. 615 (1993), this office reexamined the predecessor to the section 552.111 exception in light of the decision in *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ), and held that section 552.111 excepts only those internal communications consisting of advice, recommendations, opinions, and other material reflecting the deliberative or policymaking processes of the governmental body. Open Records Decision No. 615 at 5-6 (1993). Further, the preliminary draft of a policymaking document that has been released or is intended for release in final form is excepted from disclosure in its entirety under section 552.111 because such a draft necessarily represents the advice, recommendations, or opinions of the drafter as to the form and content of the final document. Open Records Decision No. 559 at 2 (1990). We note, however, that section 552.111 does not generally except from disclosure purely factual information that is severable from the opinion portions of internal memoranda. See *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Texas Atty. Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152, 160 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no writ); Open Records Decision No. 615 at 4-5.

You state, and the documents reflect, that a portion of the submitted information consists of draft proposals and internal communications between university officials and staff considering revisions to university admissions policies following recent decisions of the United States Supreme Court. Based on your representations and our review, we agree that a portion of the submitted information consists of draft policymaking documents and communications containing advice, recommendations, opinions, and other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the university. See Open Records Decision No. 631 (advice, opinions, and recommendations regarding a university’s policies concerning affirmative action in context of faculty retention, tenure and promotion processes relate to university’s policy mission and are excepted under section 552.111). Thus, we have marked the information that the university may withhold pursuant to section 552.111 of the Government Code. The remaining information at issue, however, does not consist of draft policymaking documents or communications containing advice, recommendations, opinions, and other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the university, and may not be withheld on that basis.

You also contend that the information submitted at Tab 5 is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code. Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information protected by 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.² TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives.³ TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1)(A), (B), (C), (D), (E). Thus, a governmental body seeking to establish that a communication is protected by the attorney-client privilege must inform this office of the identity and capacity of each individual involved in the communication. Finally, the attorney-client privilege applies only to a communication that is confidential. *Id.* 503(b)(1). A confidential communication is a communication that 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 the definition of a confidential communication 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 writ). 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) of the Government Code 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 advise that the information at Tab 5 consists of confidential communications between representatives of the university and legal counsel made in the furtherance of the rendition of legal services to the university. You also indicate that the confidentiality of the information at issue has been maintained. Based on your representations and our review of the information, we find you have established that the documents at Tab 5 are protected by the attorney-client privilege. We therefore conclude the

² The privilege does not apply when an attorney or representative is acting in a capacity other than that of providing or facilitating professional legal services to the client governmental body. *In re Texas 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). Because government attorneys often act in capacities other than that of professional legal counsel, including as administrators, investigators, or managers, the mere fact that a communication involves an attorney for the government does not demonstrate this element.

³ Specifically, the privilege applies only to confidential communications between the client or a representative of the client and the client’s lawyer or a representative of the lawyer; between the lawyer and the lawyer’s representative; by the client or a representative of the client, or the client’s lawyer or a representative of the lawyer, to a lawyer or representative of a lawyer representing another party in a pending action and concerning a matter of common interest therein; between representatives of the client or between the client and a representative of the client; or among lawyers and their representatives representing the same client. *See* TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1)(A), (B), (C), (D), (E); *see also id.* 503(a)(2), (a)(4) (defining “representative of the client,” “representative of the lawyer.”)

university may withhold this information pursuant to section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.⁴

Finally, we note that the submitted documents contain an e-mail address of a member of the public. Section 552.137 of the Government Code provides:

(a) Except as otherwise provided by this section, an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body is confidential and not subject to disclosure under this chapter.

(b) Confidential information described by this section that relates to a member of the public may be disclosed if the member of the public affirmatively consents to its release.

(c) Subsection (a) does not apply to an e-mail address:

(1) provided to a governmental body by a person who has a contractual relationship with the governmental body or by the contractor's agent;

(2) provided to a governmental body by a vendor who seeks to contract with the governmental body or by the vendor's agent;

(3) contained in a response to a request for bids or proposals, contained in a response to similar invitations soliciting offers or information relating to a potential contract, or provided to a governmental body in the course of negotiating the terms of a contract or potential contract; or

(4) provided to a governmental body on a letterhead, coversheet, printed document, or other document made available to the public.

(d) Subsection (a) does not prevent a governmental body from disclosing an e-mail address for any reason to another governmental body or to a federal agency.

Gov't Code § 552.137. Section 552.137 excepts certain e-mail addresses of members of the public that are not within the scope of section 552.137(c), unless the relevant members of the public have affirmatively consented to the release of the e-mail address. We note, however,

⁴ Based on this finding, we need not reach your remaining arguments against disclosure for this information.

that section 552.137 does not apply to the work e-mail addresses of officers or employees of a governmental body, a website address, or the general e-mail address of a business. We have marked an e-mail address in the submitted documents that is within the scope of section 552.137(a). Unless the university has received affirmative consent to disclose the marked e-mail address, the university must withhold the e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code.

In summary, we have marked the information that the university may withhold pursuant to section 552.111 of the Government Code. The university may withhold the documents submitted at Tab 5 pursuant to section 552.107(1) of the Government Code as information protected by the attorney-client privilege. We have marked an e-mail address that must be withheld under section 552.137 of the Government Code unless the university has received affirmative consent to release it. The remainder of the submitted information must be released to the requestor.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



David R. Saldivar
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

DRS/seg

Ref: ID# 203145

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Mr. Joseph Horn
Texas Association of Scholars
3311 Big Bend Drive
Austin, Texas 78731-5310
(w/o enclosures)