



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

September 29, 2014

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

OR2014-17239

Dear Ms. Tynan:

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# 537703 (OGC No. 156758).

The University of Texas System (the "system") received a request for communications involving specified individuals and pertaining to specified topics for a specified period of time.¹ You state you will make some information available to the requestor. You inform us the system will redact certain information under section 552.117 of the Government Code as permitted by section 552.024(c) of the Government Code, certain information under section 552.136(c) of the Government Code, and personal e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code in accordance with Open Records Decision

¹You note the system sought and received clarification of the request. See Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (providing that if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify the request); see also *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or overbroad request for public information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

No. 684 (2009).² You claim portions of the remaining requested information are 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.³

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. *See* 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. Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate that the information at issue constitutes or documents a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the governmental body must demonstrate the communication was 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). Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives. *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, 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

²Section 552.117 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, social security numbers, emergency contact information, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body. *See* Gov't Code § 552.117. 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 id.* §§ 552.117, .024(c). Section 552.136 of the Government Code permits a governmental body to withhold the information described in section 552.136(b) without the necessity of seeking a decision from this office. *See id.* § 552.136(c). 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). Open Records Decision No. 684 serves as a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information, including personal e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision. *See* ORD 684.

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.

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 that the confidentiality of the communication has been maintained. Section 552.107(1) generally excepts an entire communication that a governmental body has demonstrated as being 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) (attorney-client privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein).

You claim some of the submitted information, which you have marked, consists of communications between system attorneys, officials, employees, and representatives that were made for the purpose of providing legal services to the system. You further state these communications were intended to be and have remained confidential. Based on these representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information you have marked. Therefore, the system may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.⁴

Section 552.111 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[a]n 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, writ ref’d n.r.e.); *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 that 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

⁴As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure for this information.

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). Additionally, section 552.111 does not generally except from disclosure purely factual information that is severable from the opinion portions of internal memoranda. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.); ORD 615 at 4-5. 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 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 some of the remaining information, which you have marked, consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations of system employees and officials pertaining to policymaking matters. Further, you explain some of this information consists of draft documents that were released to the public in their final form. Upon review, we find the system may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code.⁵

In summary, the system may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code and the information you have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The system must release the remaining 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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/>

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

[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, appearing to read 'Cristian Rosas-Grillet', written in a cursive style.

Cristian Rosas-Grillet
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CRG/dls

Ref: ID# 537703

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)