



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

July 22, 2011

Ms. Zeena Angadicheril
Office of the General Counsel
The University of Texas System
201 West Seventh Street
Austin, Texas 78701-2902

OR2011-10507

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# 424703 (OGC # 137062).

The University of Texas System (the "university") received a request for correspondence among a specified group of individuals since February 1, 2011, regarding the University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center's (the "center") search for a President and the role of research at that institution.¹ You inform us the university has no responsive information as to some of the specified individuals.² You state some information will be released to the requestor, and the university will redact personal e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of

¹ You state, and provide documentation showing, the university sought and received clarification of the request. *See* Gov't Code § 522.222(b) (stating if information requested is unclear or large amount has been requested, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify or narrow request, but may not inquire into purpose for which information will be used).

² The Act does not require a governmental body that receives a request for information to create information that did not exist when the request was received. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.— San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 563 at 8 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

the Government Code as permitted by Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).³ You claim the remaining requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107, 552.111, 552.123, and 552.136 of the Government Code. We have considered the claimed exceptions and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.⁴

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 Decision No. 676 at 6-7. 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 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). 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, orig. proceeding). 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).

³ Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009) is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold ten categories of information, including 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.

⁴ We 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.

You state the e-mails you have marked are communications between individuals you have identified as university attorneys, officials, and employees. You state the communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of legal services, and 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 marked information. Accordingly, the university may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.⁵

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.” 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 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

⁵ Because our ruling is dispositive as to this information, we do not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

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 of section 552.111). 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.

We note section 552.111 can encompass a governmental body's communications with a third-party, including a consultant or other party with which the governmental body shares a common deliberative process or privity of interest. *See* Open Records Decision No. 561 at 9 (1990) (Gov't Code § 552.111 encompasses communications with party with which governmental body has privity of interest or common deliberative process). In order 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 the information you have marked consists of opinions, advice, and recommendations regarding the center's search for a new President. You identify the parties to these communications as university officials and employees, and third-parties with whom the university has a privity of interest in the search for a new President. You further state the final versions of draft documents have been publicly released. Upon review, we find portions of the information you have marked pertain to the university's policymaking processes. Accordingly, the university may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111. The remaining information you marked under section 552.111 either consists of factual information or internal administrative or personnel matters. We conclude you have failed to demonstrate this remaining information either reveals internal communications containing advice, recommendations, or opinions reflecting the policymaking processes of the university or pertains to administrative or personnel matters of a broad scope that affect the university's policy mission. Therefore, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.111.

Section 552.123 of the Government Code excepts from required public disclosure:

The name of an applicant for the position of chief executive officer of an institution of higher education, and other information that would tend to identify the applicant, . . . except that the governing body of the institution must give public notice of the name or names of the finalists being considered for the position at least 21 days before the date of the meeting at which final action or vote is to be taken on the employment of the person.

Act of May 29, 2011, 82nd Leg., R.S., S.B. 5, § 5.01 (to be codified as an amendment to Gov't Code § 552.123). This office has previously held, and the legislature recently amended section 552.123 to explicitly provide, that this exception permits the withholding of any information that would tend to identify candidates, not just their names. Examples of information identifying individuals might include, but are not limited to, resumes, professional qualifications, membership in professional organizations, dates of birth, current positions, publications, letters of recommendation, or any other information that can be uniquely associated with a particular applicant. *See* Open Records Decision No. 540 at 4 (1990) (construing statutory predecessor to section 552.123). In addition, the exception protects the identities of all persons being considered for the position of university chief executive officer, whether they are nominated or apply on their own initiative. *Id.* at 5.

You state the center is an "institution of higher education" as defined by section 61.003(8) of the Education Code, and the President is the "chief executive officer" of the center. You state the university released the name of the chosen finalist and that the remaining information contains the identifying information of the remaining candidates for the position of President of the center. Based on your representations and our review of the submitted information, we conclude the university may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.123. However, we find you have failed to demonstrate how the remaining information at issue identifies or tends to identify particular candidates. Thus, the university may not withhold the remaining information pursuant to section 552.123 of the Government Code.

Finally, you claim a portion of the remaining information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.136 of the Government Code. This section provides that "[n]otwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, 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). An access device number is one that may be used to "(1) obtain money, goods, services, or another thing of value; or (2) initiate a transfer of funds other than a transfer originated solely by paper instrument." *Id.* § 552.136(a). You contend the telephone numbers and access codes you have marked under section 552.136 could be used to access teleconferencing accounts and arrange long-distance telephone calls. We agree the marked information constitutes access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136 and must be withheld on that basis.

In summary, the university may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code and the information we have marked under sections 552.111 and 552.123 of the Government Code. The university must withhold the information you have marked under section 552.136 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.

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,



Misty Haberer Barham
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MHB/bs

Ref: ID # 424703

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)