



January 22, 2015

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

OR2015-01211

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# 550945 (OGC# 159075).

The University of Texas at Austin (the "university") received a request for all e-mails, text messages, or other correspondence from university administration officials during a specified time period pertaining to a named employee's contract or employment terms. You state some of the responsive information will be released to the requestor. You claim portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107 and 552.111 of the Government Code. You also state you notified Oklahoma State University ("OSU") and the named employee of the request for information and of their rights to submit comments to this office as to why the requested information should or should not be released. *See Gov't Code § 552.304* (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released). We have received comments from both parties.¹ We have

¹We note, in its comments to this office, OSU states it does not object to the release of any of the requested information.

considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

You state, and we agree, portions of the submitted information do not pertain to the named individual and are, thus, not responsive to the present request. The university need not release the non-responsive information you have indicated and we have marked in response to this request, and this ruling will not address that information.³

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information that comes within the attorney-client privilege. *Id.* § 552.107. 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

²We 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.

³As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your argument against disclosure of this information.

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 claim the information you have marked, as well as the corresponding attachments, are excepted from disclosure under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. You state the information at issue consists of communications between attorneys for the university and university employees. You state the communications were made for the purpose of providing legal counsel to employees and officials of the university and the University of Texas System. You further state these communications have been kept confidential, and they have not been disclosed to parties other than those encompassed by the attorney-client privilege. 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 university may withhold the information you have marked, as well as the corresponding attachments, 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). *See ORD 615*. 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 id.* 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)*.

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

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 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 information you have marked and indicated consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations relating to policymaking matters of the university. You further state the information at issue consists of draft policymaking documents that were intended to be released to the public in their final forms, and which reflect the advice, opinions, and recommendations of university employees. Upon review, however, we find the information at issue pertains to a personnel matter that is not of broad scope and does not constitute advice, opinions, recommendations, or other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the university. Thus, we find you have failed to demonstrate how the deliberative process privilege applies to any portion of the information at issue. Accordingly, the university may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

In summary, the university may withhold the information you have marked, as well as the corresponding attachments, under section 552.107(1) 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, 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,



Alley Latham
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

AKL/dls

Ref: ID# 550945

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Steve Stephens
General Counsel
Board of Regents
For Oklahoma State University
and the A & M Colleges
Student Union, Fifth Floor
Stillwater, Oklahoma 74078-7040
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. David J. Beck
Beck Redden, L.L.P.
515 Congress Avenue, Suite 1750
Austin, Texas 78701
(w/o enclosures)