



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

GREG ABBOTT

June 28, 2011

Ms. Zeena Angadicheril
Office of General Counsel
The University of Texas System
201 West Seventh Street
Austin, Texas 78701

OR2011-09194

Dear Ms. Angadicheril:

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# 420497 (OGC #136227).

The University of Texas System (the "university") received a request for "all records, including status updates and reports, concerning so-called breakthrough solutions for higher education advanced at" a particular meeting between university regents and the governor. You state that "the majority of" the responsive information is being released to the requestor. You also state that, as permitted by section 552.024(c) of the Government Code, you will redact information subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code.¹ In addition, you state you will redact personal e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government

¹Section 552.117 of the Government Code exempts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, emergency contact information, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body. Act of May 24, 2011, 82nd Leg., R.S., S.B. 1638, § 2 (to be codified as an amendment to Gov't Code § 552.117(a)). Section 552.024 of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to withhold information subject to section 552.117 without requesting a decision from this office if the employee or official or former employee or official chooses not to allow public access to the information. See Gov't Code § 552.024(c), Act of May 24, 2011, 82nd Leg., R.S., S.B. 1638, § 2.

Code in accordance with Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).² You claim portions of the remaining responsive information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, 552.111, and 552.136 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.³

Initially, we note you have marked portions of the submitted information as being non-responsive to the request for information. This decision does not address the public availability of the non-responsive information, and that information need 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 the doctrines of common-law and constitutional privacy. The doctrine of common-law privacy excepts from public disclosure private information about an individual that (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82.

The types of information considered intimate or 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. *Id.* at 683. This office has found some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses are excepted from required public disclosure 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 (1987). The first type

²This office issued Open Records Decision No. 684, a previous determination to all governmental bodies, which authorizes the withholding of ten categories of information, including personal e-mail addresses of members of the public under section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

³We 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.

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 the information we have marked is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Accordingly, the university must withhold this information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find you have failed to demonstrate how any of the remaining information you seek to withhold is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public concern. Thus, none of the remaining information you have marked may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of common-law privacy. Further, you have not demonstrated how any of the remaining information at issue falls within the zones of privacy or implicates privacy interests for purposes of constitutional privacy. Thus, none of the remaining information you have marked may be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with 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. *See* Open Records 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. *See* 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. *See 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 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. *See 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 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 assert the information you have marked consists of attorney-client communications. You inform us the communications are between attorneys for and officials and employees of the university and were made for the purpose of requesting and providing legal advice. You have identified some of the parties to the communications. You assert these communications were made in confidence and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to some of the information at issue. Thus, the university may generally withhold the e-mails we have marked.⁴ We note some of the e-mail strings at issue, which we have marked, contain communications with non-privileged parties. These non-privileged e-mails, to the extent they exist separate and apart from the privileged communications, may not be withheld under section 552.107(1).

Section 552.111 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “an interagency or intra-agency 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 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

⁴As our ruling is dispositive with respect to the privileged information, we need not address your remaining argument against its disclosure.

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).

This office has also concluded 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). When determining if an interagency memorandum is excepted from disclosure under section 552.111, we must consider whether the entities between which the memorandum is passed share a privity of interest or common deliberative process with regard to the policy matter at issue. See *id.* 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 *id.*

You state the information at issue consists of advice, recommendations, and opinions of university personnel. You further state the draft documents were intended for release in their final forms and, in fact, the final forms have been released. Upon review, we find the information we have marked consists of advice, opinions, or recommendations relating to policymaking. Thus, the university may withhold the information we have marked under

section 552.111. However, we find you have failed to demonstrate that the remaining information reveals advice, opinions, or recommendations that pertain to policymaking. Accordingly, we find the remaining information at issue is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.111 of the Government Code, and it may not be withheld on that basis.

You claim that the remaining information contains information subject to section 552.136(b) of the Government Code. This section provides “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential.” Gov’t Code § 552.136(b); *see also id.* § 552.136(b) (defining access device number). Upon review, you failed to establish how any of the remaining information constitutes a credit card, debit card, charge card, or an access device number for purposes of section 552.136. Thus, none of the remaining information may be withheld on this basis.

In summary, the university may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code; however, to the extent the marked non-privileged e-mails exist separate and apart from the submitted e-mail strings, they may not be withheld under section 552.107(1). The university may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The remaining 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,



Cindy Nettles
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CN/dls

Ref: ID# 420497

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)