



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

April 26, 2013

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

OR2013-06911

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# 485412 (OGC# 148353).

The University of Texas System (the "system") received a request for all records related to a named system employee. You state you have released some of the requested information to the requestor. You inform us you will redact information subject to section 552.117 pursuant to section 552.024(c) of the Government Code.¹ You claim some of the submitted 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

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 the doctrine of common-law privacy,

¹Section 552.024(c)(2) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact information protected by section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code without the necessity of requesting a decision under the Act if the current or former employee or official to whom the information pertains timely chooses not to allow public access to the information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.024(c)(2).

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.

which protects information if it (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 established. *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. *See id.* at 683. Generally, however, the public has a legitimate interest in information that relates to public employment and public employees. *See* Open Records Decision No. 562 at 10 (1990) (personnel file information does not involve most intimate aspects of human affairs, but in fact touches on matters of legitimate public concern). Information pertaining to the work conduct and job performance of public employees is subject to a legitimate public interest and, therefore, generally not protected from disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (public employee's job performance does not generally constitute employee's private affairs), 455 (public employee's job performance or abilities generally not protected by privacy), 444 (1986) (public has legitimate interest in knowing reasons for dismissal, demotion, promotion, or resignation of public employee), 423 (1984)(scope of public employee privacy is narrow).

Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate any of the information you have marked is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Accordingly, none of the information you have marked may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the constitutional right to privacy, which protects two kinds of interests. *See Whalen v. Roe*, 429 U.S. 589, 599-600 (1977); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 3-5 (1992), 478 at 4 (1987), 455 at 3-7 (1987). The first is the interest in independence in making certain important decisions related to the "zones of privacy," which include matters related to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education. *See Fado v. Coon*, 633 F.2d 1172 (5th Cir. 1981); *see also* ORD 455 at 3-7. The second constitutionally protected privacy interest is in freedom from public disclosure of certain personal matters. *See Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Tex.*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir.1985); *see also* ORD 455 at 6-7. This aspect of constitutional privacy balances the individual's privacy interest against the public's interest in the information. *See* ORD 455 at 7. Constitutional privacy under section 552.101 is reserved for "the most intimate aspects of human affairs." *Id.* at 8 (quoting *Ramie*, 765 F.2d at 492). Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate how any portion of the information you have marked falls within the zones of privacy or implicates an individual's privacy interests for purposes of constitutional privacy. Consequently, the system may not withhold any of the information you have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with constitutional privacy.

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 information you have marked consists of confidential communications between attorneys for the system and their clients. You further state that these communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the system. 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 system may generally withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. However, we note these privileged e-mail strings include e-mails from non-privileged parties that are separately responsive to the instant request. Accordingly, if these e-mails, which we have marked, exist separate and

apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they are included, then the system may not withhold the non-privileged e-mails we have marked under section 552.107(1).

You raise section 552.111 of the Government Code for portions of the remaining information, as well as for the non-privileged e-mails to the extent they are maintained by the system separate and apart from the submitted e-mail strings in which they appear. 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. Section 552.111 encompasses the deliberative process privilege. *See* Open Records Decision No. 615 at 2 (1993). The purpose of this exception 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, orig. proceeding); Open Records Decision No. 538 at 1–2 (1990).

In Open Records Decision No. 615 (1993), 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, opinions, recommendations, 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. *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).

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). 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.

You state some of the remaining information contains the deliberations of employees and officials at the system and the system's recommended changes and revisions to various policy issues. Upon review, we find the system may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, we find you have failed to demonstrate how the system shares a privity of interest or common deliberative process with the non-privileged parties in the remaining information at issue. Therefore, the system may not withhold this information under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Section 552.117 of the Government Code excepts 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 who request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code.³ Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). Whether a particular piece of information is protected by section 552.117 must be determined at the time the request for it is made. See Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Therefore, the system may only withhold the information under section 552.117 on behalf of current or former employees who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for this information was made. To the extent the employees whose information is at issue timely elected to keep such information confidential under section 552.024, the system must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117 of the Government Code. However, if the employees did not make timely elections, the system may not withhold the marked information on this basis.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body," unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). See Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail address at issue is not specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). As such, this e-mail address, which we have marked, must be withheld under section 552.137, unless the owner of the address has affirmatively consented to its release.⁴ See *id.* § 552.137(b).

³The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. See Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

⁴Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009) serves as a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information, including e-mail addresses of members of the public under section 552.137, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

In summary, the system may generally withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code; however, to the extent the e-mails we have marked exist separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they are included, then the system may not withhold this information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The system may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. To the extent the employees whose information is at issue timely elected confidentiality, the system must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The system must withhold the e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner of the address has affirmatively consented to its release. 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,



Vanessa Burgess
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

VB/dls

Ref: ID# 485412

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)