



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

November 30, 2011

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

OR2011-17637

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# 437420 (ORR# 139667).

The University of Texas at Austin (the "university") received a request for all e-mails sent to or from the university's named president and athletic director between September 5 and September 12, 2011, that include specified words or phrases. You state the university will release some of the requested information, but will redact e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009). *See* Open Records Decision No. 684 (previous determination authorizing any governmental body to withhold ten categories of information, including e-mail address of member of the public under section 552.137, without necessity of requesting attorney general opinion). You claim some of the submitted information is either not subject to the Act or excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107, 552.111, and 552.136 of the Government Code. You also state you notified the Big 12 Conference (the "Big 12") and the Bowl Championship Series (the "BCS") of the university's receipt of the request for information and of the right of each to submit arguments to this office as to why the requested information should not be released to the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 at 3 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in the Act in certain circumstances). We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.021 of the Government Code provides for public access to "public information." Gov't Code § 552.021. Section 552.002 of the Government Code defines public information as "information that is collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in

connection with the transaction of official business: (1) by a governmental body; or (2) for a governmental body and the governmental body owns the information or has a right of access to it.” *Id.* § 552.002(a). Thus, information that is collected, assembled, or maintained by a third party may be subject to disclosure under the Act if a governmental body owns or has a right of access to the information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 462 (1987); *cf.* Open Records Decision No. 499 (1988). The submitted information includes a communication between the BCS and the university’s president. You assert the president received this communication in his capacity as a member of the president oversight committee of the BCS, not in his capacity as president of the university, and this communication pertains to the decisions and operations of the BCS, not the operations of the university. Having considered the university’s arguments and reviewed the information at issue, we find the information at issue, which you have marked, was not “collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business” by or for the university. Gov’t Code § 552.002; *see* Open Records Decision No. 635 (1995) (statutory predecessor not applicable to personal information unrelated to official business and created or maintained by state employee involving *de minimis* use of state resources). Therefore, this information is not subject to the Act, and the university is not required to release it in response to the request for information.

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 (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. 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). 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).

You explain the submitted information contains confidential communications between attorneys and employees of the university that were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services. You also assert the communications were intended to be confidential and their confidentiality has been maintained. After reviewing your arguments and the submitted information, we agree this information constitutes privileged attorney-client communications. Thus, the university may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107.

You assert some of the remaining submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.111 of the Government Code, which 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 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 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.

You assert some of the submitted information contains the deliberations of university employees pertaining to recommended changes, review of, and revisions to plans that involve research opportunities and the university's athletic department. You also state some of this information includes drafts that were intended for release in their final form. Upon review, we find you have established some of the information at issue is encompassed by the deliberative process privilege. Therefore, we find the university may withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.111. However, we conclude the university has failed to establish the remaining information at issue consists of advice, opinion, or recommendations relating to policymaking processes of the university. Therefore, the university may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.111 on that ground.

You assert some of the remaining information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.136 of the Government Code. Section 552.136 provides the following:

(a) In this section, "access device" means a card, plate, code, account number, personal identification number, electronic serial number, mobile identification number, or other telecommunications service, equipment, or instrument identifier or means of account access that alone or in conjunction with another access device 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.

(b) Notwithstanding 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. You seek to withhold a teleconferencing telephone number and access code. You explain the telephone number and access code do not change and can be used to access teleconferencing accounts of the university in order to arrange long distance telephone calls. Based on your arguments and our review, we conclude this information, which you have marked, constitutes access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136.

Therefore, the university must withhold the information you have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

Finally, an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) to submit its reasons, if any, as to why requested information relating to it should be withheld from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, neither the Big 12 nor the BCS has submitted to this office any reasons explaining why the requested information should not be released. We thus have no basis for concluding any portion of the submitted information constitutes proprietary information of these third parties, and the university may not withhold any portion of the submitted information on that basis. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3.

We conclude the following: (1) the university is not required to release the information you have marked under section 552.002; (2) the university may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107 of the Government Code and the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code; (3) the university must withhold the information you have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code; and (4) the university must release the remaining submitted 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.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,



James L. Coggeshall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JLC/ag

Ref: ID# 437420

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Dan Beebe
Big 12 Conference
400 East John Carpenter Freeway
Irving, Texas 75062
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Bill Hicock
Bowl Championship Series
8417 Delmar Lane
Prairie Village, Kansas 66207
(w/o enclosures)