



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

July 20, 2010

Ms. Neera Chatterjee
The University of Texas System
Office of General Counsel
201 West Seventh Street
Austin, Texas 78701-2902

OR2010-10770

Dear Ms. Chatterjee:

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#387301 (UT System ORR#102).

The University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston (the "university") received a request for several categories of information in the possession of a named employee or maintained by the Department of Internet Technology's electronic archival, including all information pertaining to the requestor from May 1, 2008 through April 30, 2010. You state you are providing some responsive information to the requestor. You further state you will redact home telephone numbers, home addresses, and family member information subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code under section 552.024 of the Government Code.¹ You claim that the remaining requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

¹See Gov't Code § 552.024(c)(2) (if employee or official or former employee or official chooses not to allow public access to his or her personal information, the governmental body may redact the information without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office).

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.

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. Section 552.101 encompasses confidentiality provisions such as section 161.032 of the Health and Safety Code, which provides in relevant part:

(a) The records and proceedings of a medical committee are confidential and are not subject to court subpoena.

...

(c) Records, information, or reports of a medical committee . . . and records, information, or reports provided by a medical committee . . . to the governing body of a public hospital, hospital district, or hospital authority are not subject to disclosure under Chapter 552, Government Code.

Health & Safety Code § 161.032(a), (c). For purposes of this confidentiality provision, a “medical committee” includes any committee, including a joint committee, of . . . a university medical school or health science center[.]” *Id.* § 161.031(a). The term also encompasses “a committee appointed ad hoc to conduct a specific investigation or established under state or federal law or rule or under the bylaws or rules of the organization or institution.” *Id.* § 161.031(b). Section 161.0315 provides in relevant part that “[t]he governing body of a . . . university medical school or health science center . . . may form . . . a medical committee, as defined by section 161.031, to evaluate medical peer review committee and health care services[.]” *Id.* § 161.0315(a).

The precise scope of the “medical committee” provision has been the subject of a number of judicial decisions. *See Memorial Hosp.—The Woodlands v. McCown*, 927 S.W.2d 1 (Tex. 1996); *Barnes v. Whittington*, 751 S.W.2d 493 (Tex. 1988); *Jordan v. Fourth Supreme Judicial Dist.*, 701 S.W.2d 644 (Tex. 1986); *Hood v. Phillips*, 554 S.W.2d 160 (Tex. 1977); *Texarkana Memorial Hosp., Inc. v. Jones*, 551 S.W.2d 33 (Tex. 1977); *McAllen Methodist Hosp. v. Ramirez*, 855 S.W.2d 195 (Tex. App.—Corpus Christi 1993), disapproved by, *Memorial Hosp.—The Woodlands v. McCown*, 927 S.W.2d 1 (Tex. 1996); *Doctor’s Hosp. v. West*, 765 S.W.2d 812 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1988); *Goodspeed v. Street*, 747 S.W.2d 526 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 1988). These cases establish that “documents generated by the committee in order to conduct open and thorough review” are confidential. This protection extends “to documents that have been prepared by or at the direction of the committee for committee purposes.” *Jordan*, 701 S.W.2d at 647-48. Protection does not extend to documents “gratuitously submitted to a committee” or “created without committee impetus and purpose.” *Id.* at 648; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 591 (1991) (construing statutory predecessor to section 161.032 of the Health and Safety Code). We note that section 161.032 does not make confidential “records made or maintained in the regular course of business by a hospital[.]” Health & Safety Code § 161.032(f); *see Memorial Hosp.—The Woodlands*, 927 S.W.2d at 10 (stating that reference to statutory

predecessor to section 160.007 in section 161.032 is clear signal that records should be accorded same treatment under both statutes in determining if they were made in ordinary course of business).

You state that the information you have marked consists of records of the university's School of Public Health's Biostatistics Faculty Committee (the "committee"), which you contend is a medical committee. You also indicate the information at issue was prepared by or for use of the committee regarding issues relevant to the committee. Upon review, we agree the committee constitutes a medical committee as defined by section 161.031 and find that the information you have marked under section 161.032 is confidential, and must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 161.032 of the Health and Safety Code.

Section 552.101 also encompasses the doctrines of common-law and constitutional privacy. Common-law privacy protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, such that its release would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976). The types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. *See id.* at 683. This office has found that some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses are confidential under common-law privacy. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps).*

Constitutional privacy consists of two interrelated types of privacy: (1) the right to make certain kinds of decisions independently and (2) an individual's interest in avoiding disclosure of personal matters. *See Whalen v. Roe*, 429 U.S. 589, 599-600 (1977); *Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 3-5 (1992), 478 at 4 (1987), 455 at 3-7.* The first type protects an individual's autonomy within "zones of privacy" which include matters related to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education. *ORD 455 at 4.* The second type of constitutional privacy requires a balancing between the individual's privacy interests and the public's need to know information of public concern. *Id.* at 7. The scope of information protected is narrower than that under the common-law doctrine of privacy; constitutional privacy under section 552.101 is reserved for "the most intimate aspects of human affairs." *Id.* at 5 (quoting *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Tex.*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985)).

Upon review, we find that portions of the information at issue are highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate interest to the public. Thus, the university must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find that the remaining information at issue is not highly intimate or

embarrassing information of no legitimate public interest. Further, we find you have not demonstrated how any portion of the remaining information at issue falls within the zones of privacy or implicates an individual's privacy interests for purposes of constitutional privacy. Accordingly, the university may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with either common-law or constitutional privacy.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information that comes 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 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). 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, lawyer representatives, and a lawyer representing another party in a pending action and concerning a matter of common interest therein. *See* TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1)(A)-(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 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 that the information you have marked under section 552.107 constitutes a communication between university employees sent at the request of one of the university's

senior legal officers. You further state that this communication was made in confidence and has maintained its confidentiality. 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 university may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107 of the Government Code.

Section 552.111 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, recommendations, and opinions 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, and opinions that reflect 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. The 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). Moreover, 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).

You state the information you have marked under section 552.111 reflects frank and open deliberations among university faculty regarding changes, review of, and revisions to a specific policy. You further state that all of the individuals who participated in these communications were in policy-making positions by nature of their positions as faculty members and university employees. As such, you contend they were exercising their policy-making responsibility during the time of these communications. Upon review, we agree that portions of the information at issue are subject to section 552.111. Accordingly, the university may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, we find that the university has failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.111 of the Government Code to the remaining information at

issue. Accordingly, no portion of the remaining information at issue may be withheld on this basis.

In summary: 1) the university must withhold the information you have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 161.032 of the Health and Safety Code; 2) the university must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy; 3) the university may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107 of the Government Code; and 4) the university may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The remaining requested information must be released.

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.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,



Vanessa Burgess
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

VB/tp

Ref: ID#387301

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)