



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

August 4, 2009

Ms. Neera Chatterjee
Office of General Counsel
The University of Texas System
201 West Seventh Street
Austin, Texas 78701-2902

OR2009-10755

Dear Ms. Chatterjee:

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# 351039.

The University of Texas Medical Health Science Center at Houston (the "university") received a request for records in the e-mail accounts of two named individuals pertaining to the "HOOP Policy 2.12.3" and occurring over a specified period of time. You state some information has been released. You claim portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107, 552.111, 552.117, and 552.137 of the Government Code. In addition, you believe the request for information may implicate the privacy or proprietary interests of Methodist Hospital and The University of Texas M.D. Anderson Cancer Center. You state, and provide documentation showing, you notified the third parties of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the requested 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 the Act in certain circumstances). We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

An interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of a governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) of the Government Code to submit its reasons, if any, as to why requested information relating to that party should be withheld from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, neither

¹We 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.

of the third parties has submitted comments to this office explaining why any portion of the submitted information relating to it should not be released to the requestor. Thus, we have no basis to conclude that the release of any portion of the submitted information would implicate the interests of those third parties, and none of the information may be withheld on that basis. *See id.* § 552.110; Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (stating that business enterprise that claims exception for commercial or financial information under section 552.110(b) must show by specific factual evidence 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). As no exception to disclosure has been raised for the information designated as Tab 5B, that information must be released to the requestor.

You claim a portion of the remaining information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. Section 552.107(1) 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 that 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 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 lawyers representing another party in a pending action concerning a matter of common interest therein. 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 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, no writ). 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 that the information at issue consists of communications between university attorneys and university employees, and that these communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of legal services and advice to the university. You further state that these communications were made in confidence, and that their confidentiality has been maintained. You have specifically identified the university attorneys and employees at issue. Based on your representations and our review of the submitted information, we find that you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information you have marked. Accordingly, the university may withhold this information under section 552.107 of the Government Code.²

Next, you assert that a portion of the remaining information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.111 of the Government Code. 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. 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 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 No. 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. *See ORD 615 at 5*. But if factual information is so inextricably intertwined with material involving advice, opinion,

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

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 that 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 that the information you have marked consists of preliminary drafts of policy documents and communications amongst university employees containing advice, opinions, and recommendations regarding those policy matters. You further state the university will or has already released the final version of the policy document at issue. Based upon your representations and our review, we agree the university may withhold some of the information at issue, which we have marked, under section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, we find that the remaining information at issue consists of purely factual information that is not excepted under section 552.111. Accordingly, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.111.

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who request this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.117(a)(1), .024. Additionally, section 552.117 encompasses personal cellular telephone numbers, provided the cellular telephone service is paid for by the employee with his or her own funds. *See* Open Records Decision No. 670 at 6 (2001) (extending section 552.117(a)(1) exception to personal cellular telephone number and personal pager number of employee who elects to withhold home telephone number in accordance with section 552.024). 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). The university may only withhold information under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of former or current employees who have made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for information was made. You have marked the information that is subject to section 552.117. You do not inform this office that the university employee whose information is at issue elected to keep her personal information confidential before the university received the instant request for information. We must therefore rule conditionally. If the employee whose personal information you have marked timely elected to withhold her personal information under section 552.024, the university must withhold the marked information under

section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the university may only withhold a personal cellular telephone number if the cellular service was paid for with the employee's own funds. If the employee did not timely elect confidentiality, the university may not withhold the marked information under section 552.117(a)(1).

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). Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail address you have marked is not of a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c) of the Government Code. In addition, you state the university has not received consent for the release of the marked e-mail address. Therefore, the university must withhold the e-mail address you have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code.

In summary, 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. To the extent the employee at issue made a timely election under section 552.024, the university must withhold the information you have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the university may only withhold a personal cellular telephone number if the cellular service was paid for with the employee's own funds. The university must withhold the e-mail address you have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code. As we have received no further arguments against disclosure, 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 at (512) 475-2497.

Sincerely,



Matt Entsminger
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MRE/cc

Ref: ID# 351039

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)