



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 29, 2016

Ms. Jennifer Burnett  
Attorney & Public Information Coordinator  
Office of General Counsel  
The University of Texas System  
201 West 7<sup>th</sup> Street  
Austin, Texas 78701-2901

OR2016-21964

Dear Ms. Burnett:

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# 628378 (OGC# 170625).

The University of Texas System (the "system") received a request for information and communications pertaining to the system's Group Purchasing Organization ("GPO") Accreditation Program.<sup>1</sup> You state the system will release some information. You state the system is withholding certain marked information subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code as permitted by section 552.024(c) of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> You also state the system is withholding certain marked information pursuant to section 552.136(c)

---

<sup>1</sup>You state the system sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify 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 information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

<sup>2</sup>Section 552.024 of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to withhold information subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code without requesting a decision from this office if the current or former employee or official chooses not to allow public access to the information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.024(c).

of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup> You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107, 552.111, and 552.116 of the Government Code. You also state release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of several third parties.<sup>4</sup> Accordingly, the system states, and provides documentation showing, it notified these third parties of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information at issue should not be released. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released), .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 the Act in certain circumstances). We have received comments from Premier. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>5</sup>

Initially, we note the system has marked some of the submitted information as non-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 such information in response to this request.

We next note 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, none of the remaining third parties has submitted to this office any reasons explaining why the requested information should not be released. Thus, we have no basis for concluding the submitted information constitutes proprietary information of these third parties, and the system may not withhold any portion of it 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

---

<sup>3</sup>Section 552.136(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 552.136(b) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See Gov't Code*. § 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).

<sup>4</sup>The third parties are: Texas Department of Information Resources; Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts; US Communities Government Purchasing Alliance; UT System Supply Chain Alliance Strategic Services Group; Region 8 Education Service Center; Premier Healthcare Alliance, LP ("Premier"); National Joint Powers Alliance; National Intergovernmental Purchasing Alliance; National Cooperative Purchasing Alliance; Local Government Purchasing Cooperative d/b/a Buyboard; FirstChoice Cooperative; Education Service Center, Region 20; Education Service Center, Region 19; E&I Cooperative Services; Choice Partners; Brazos Valley Council of Governments d/b/a Purchasing Solutions Alliance; and Amerinet, Inc. d/b/a Intalere.

<sup>5</sup>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.

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.

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 constitutes or documents a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made “to facilitate 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)(A), (B), (C), (D), (E). 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.* 503(b)(1), meaning it was “not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those: (A) to whom disclosure is made to further the rendition of professional legal services to the client; or (B) reasonably necessary to transmit 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 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 information you marked consists of communications between employees and representatives of the system and its institutions and attorneys or representatives of the attorneys for the system and its institutions. You state these communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the system. You state these communications were kept confidential and have not been disclosed to third parties. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of

the attorney-client privilege to the information you marked. Accordingly, the system may withhold the information you marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.<sup>6</sup>

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 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. *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).

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,

---

<sup>6</sup>As our ruling for this information is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against its disclosure.

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 information you marked contains the deliberative process by which system and system institution employees discussed matters regarding the GPO Accreditation Program. You also state the information at issue includes draft documents that were intended for release in their final forms. Thus, you state the information at issue consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations of the system regarding policy matters. Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we find the system has demonstrated the information at issue consists of advice, opinions, or recommendations on the policymaking matters of the system. Thus, the system may withhold the information you marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Section 552.116 of the Government Code provides,

(a) An audit working paper of an audit of the state auditor or the auditor of a state agency, an institution of higher education as defined by Section 61.003, Education Code, a county, a municipality, a school district, a hospital district, or a joint board operating under Section 22.074, Transportation Code, including any audit relating to the criminal history background check of a public school employee, is excepted from [required public disclosure]. If information in an audit working paper is also maintained in another record, that other record is not excepted from [public disclosure] by this section.

(b) In this section:

(1) "Audit" means an audit authorized or required by a statute of this state or the United States, the charter or an ordinance of a municipality, an order of the commissioners court of a county, the bylaws adopted by or other action of the governing board of a hospital district, a resolution or other action of a board of trustees of a school district, including an audit by the district relating to the criminal history background check of a public school employee, or a resolution or other action of a joint board described by Subsection (a) and includes an investigation.

(2) "Audit working paper" includes all information, documentary or otherwise, prepared or maintained in conducting an audit or preparing an audit report, including:

(A) intra-agency and interagency communications; and

(B) drafts of the audit report or portions of those drafts.

Gov't Code § 552.116. You state the system is an institution of higher education as defined by section 61.003 of the Education Code. *See* Educ. Code § 61.003. You contend the information you have marked was created and maintained in furtherance of an independent audit conducted by the system audit office related to the accreditation of GPOs used by the system and system institutions. You inform us audits such as this are authorized by the Texas Internal Auditing Act, chapter 2102 of the Texas Government Code. *See* Gov't Code §§ 2102.003 (defining types of audits), .005 (requiring state agencies to conduct internal audits), .007 (relating to duties of internal auditor). Based on your representations and our review, we agree the information at issue consists of audit working papers as defined in section 552.116(b)(2). Therefore, the system may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.116 of the Government Code.<sup>7</sup>

In summary, the system may withhold the information you have marked under sections 552.107(1), 552.111, and 552.116 of the Government Code. The remaining responsive 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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl\\_ruling\\_info.shtml](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,



Paige Lay  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

PL/som

---

<sup>7</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure for this information.

Ref: ID# 628378

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

17 Third Parties  
(w/o enclosures)