



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

September 12, 2014

Ms. Audra Gonzalez Welter
Attorney and Public Information Coordinator
Office of General Counsel
The University of Texas System
201 West Seventh Street
Austin, Texas 78701

OR2014-16202

Dear Ms. Welter:

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# 535971 (OGC No. 156545).

The University of Texas System (the "system") received a request for twelve categories of information related to Project No. 901-283.¹ You state the system will release some information to the requestor. You state the system has redacted some information pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), section 1232g of title 20 of the United States Code.² You also state the system will redact information subject to

¹We note the system sought and received clarification of the request for information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (stating that if information requested is unclear to governmental body or if a large amount of information 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).

²The United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office (the "DOE") has informed this office FERPA does not permit state and local educational authorities to disclose to this office, without parental consent, unredacted, personally identifiable information contained in education records for the purpose of our review in the open records ruling process under the Act. The DOE has determined FERPA determinations must be made by the educational authority in possession of the education records. We have posted a copy of the letter from the DOE to this office on the Attorney General's website: <http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/20060725usdoe.pdf>.

section 552.117 of the Government Code pursuant to section 552.024(c) of the Government Code and any information subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code pursuant to section 552.136(c) of the Government Code.³ You claim some of the submitted information is not subject to the Act. You also claim portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. Additionally, you state release of some of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of third parties. Accordingly, you notified Alamo Music Center, Inc., Music & Arts Center, NoackLittle, and Wenger Corporation of the request for information and of each company's right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in Act in certain circumstances). We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.⁴

You argue the submitted user names and passwords are not subject to the Act. The Act is applicable only to "public information." *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.002, .021. Section 552.002(a) defines "public information" as

[I]nformation that is written, produced, collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business:

- (1) by a governmental body;
- (2) for a governmental body and the governmental body:
 - (A) owns the information;
 - (B) has a right of access to the information; or

³Section 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). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with subsections 552.024(c-1) and (c-2). *See id.* § 552.024(c-1)-(c-2). Section 552.136 of the Government Code permits a governmental body to redact the information described in section 552.136(b) without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office. *See id.* § 552.136(c)-(e) (providing procedures for redaction of information). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.136(e). *See id.* § 552.136(d), (e).

⁴We 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 that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

(C) spends or contributes public money for the purpose of writing, producing, collecting, assembling, or maintaining the information; or

(3) by an individual officer or employee of a governmental body in the officer's or employee's official capacity and the information pertains to official business of the governmental body.

Id. § 552.002(a). Information is "in connection with the transaction of official business" if the information is created by, transmitted to, received by, or maintained by a person or entity performing official business or a government function on behalf of a governmental body and the information pertains to official business of the governmental body. *See id.* § 552.002(a-1). Thus, virtually all of the information in a governmental body's physical possession constitutes public information and thus is subject to the Act. *Id.*; *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 549 at 4 (1990), 514 at 1-2 (1988).

You assert the user name and password information is not public information subject to the Act. This office has determined certain computer information, such as source codes, documentation information, and other computer programming that has no significance other than its use as a tool for the maintenance, manipulation, or protection of public property is not the kind of information made public under section 552.021 of the Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 581 (1990). Based on the reasoning in that decision and our review of the information at issue, we determine the user name and password information you have marked does not constitute public information under section 552.002. Accordingly, the marked user name and password information is not subject to the Act and need not be disclosed.

Next, we note you have marked some of the submitted information as not responsive to the instant request. This ruling does not address the public availability of non-responsive information, and the system is not required to release non-responsive information in response to this request.

We note an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received arguments from any of the third parties. Thus, the third parties have not demonstrated the companies have protected proprietary interests in any of the submitted information. *See id.* § 552.110(a)-(b); 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, that 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.

Accordingly, the system may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interests any of the third parties may have in the information.

We note some of the submitted information falls within the scope of section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a)(5) provides for required public disclosure of “all working papers, research material, and information used to estimate the need for or expenditure of public funds or taxes by a governmental body, on completion of the estimate[,]” unless the information is made confidential under the Act or other law. Gov’t Code § 552.022(a)(5). We find the information we have indicated is subject to disclosure under section 552.022(a)(5). Although you raise the deliberative process privilege in section 552.111 for this information, this is a discretionary exception to disclosure and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See id.* § 552.007; Open Records Decision Nos. 677 at 10-11 (2002) (deliberative process privilege under section 552.111 may be waived), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (governmental body may waive section 552.111). Accordingly, the system may not withhold the information we have indicated under section 552.111 of the Government Code. Therefore, as the system raises no other exception to disclosure of this information, it must be released pursuant to section 552.022(a)(5) of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts “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, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) 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 and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. This office has found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 523 (1989) (common-law privacy protects credit reports, financial statements, and other personal financial information), 373 (1983) (sources of income not related to financial transaction between individual and governmental body protected under common-law privacy). Upon review, we find the information you have marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the system must withhold the information you have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. Gov’t Code § 552.107(1). 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). 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. *See 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 state the e-mails you have marked consist of communications between a system employee and a consultant of the system concerning attorney-client communications that were made for the purpose of effectuating legal representation. You further state the communications have been kept confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Thus, the system may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.⁵

You state the remaining information you have marked is excepted from disclosure under section 552.111 of the Government Code, which excepts from disclosure “[a]n interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in

⁵As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure.

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, orig. proceeding); 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, orig. proceeding). 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. ORD 615 at 5; see also *City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351, 364 (Tex. 2000); *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Texas Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.). 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). However, 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. ORD 615 at 5-6; see also *Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d at 364 (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking).

Further, section 552.111 does not generally except from disclosure facts and written observations of facts and events that are severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 37 S.W.3d at 157; 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 Nos. 631 at 2 (section 552.111 encompasses information created for governmental body by outside consultant acting at governmental body’s request and performing task that is within governmental body’s authority), 561 at 9 (1990) (section 552.111 encompasses communications with party with which governmental body has privity of interest or common deliberative process), 462 at 14 (1987) (section 552.111 applies to memoranda prepared by governmental body’s consultants). 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.

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 state the remaining information you have marked under section 552.111 consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations relating to policymaking matters of the system. You state the marked information consists of documents communicated between and among employees and officials of the system, a system institution, and employees of NoackLittle, a third party consultant hired by the system to coordinate Project 901-283 and recommend changes involving policy issues regarding a related request for proposal. You further state some of the information at issue consists of draft policymaking documents that will be released to the public in their final form. Based on your representations and our review, we find the remaining information you have marked under section 552.111 consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations related to policymaking matters of the system. Accordingly, the system may withhold the remaining information you have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

You contend some of the remaining information may be protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; *see* Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit.

In summary, the system must release the information we have indicated pursuant to 552.022(a)(5) of the Government Code. The system must withhold the information you have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The system may withhold the remaining information you have marked under sections 552.107(1) and 552.111 of the Government Code. The system must release the remaining responsive information; however, any information protected by copyright may only be released in accordance with copyright law.

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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, 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 may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Britni Fabian". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Britni Fabian
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

BF/bhf

Ref: ID# 535971

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)