



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 1, 2015

Ms. Audra Gonzalez Welter
Attorney & Public Information Coordinator
The University of Texas System
Office of General Counsel
201 West Seventh Street
Austin, Texas 78701-2902

OR2015-18280

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# 577620 (OGC# 162507).

The University of Texas at Arlington (the "university") received a request for all written correspondence sent or received by five named university employees containing specified words and phrases during a specified period of time. You state the university will release some of the requested information. We understand the university is withholding e-mail addresses of members of the public under section 552.137 of the Government Code pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).¹ You claim some of the submitted information is exempted from disclosure under sections 552.106, 552.107, 552.111, and 552.117 of the Government Code.² We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.³

¹We note Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain information, including an e-mail address of a member of the public under section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

²Although you do not raise section 552.117 of the Government Code in your brief, we understand you to raise this exception based on your markings.

³We 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.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code 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 “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 have marked consists of communications between University of Texas System (the “system”) and university attorneys and employees in their capacities as clients. You state these communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the university. 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 have marked. Accordingly, the university may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.⁴

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

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, 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 contains the deliberative process by which university and system employees discussed matters regarding proposed legislation pertaining to campus carry and open carry. 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 university regarding policy matters. Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we find the university has demonstrated the information at issue consists of advice, opinions, or recommendations on the policymaking matters of the university. Thus, the university may withhold the remaining information you have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code.⁵

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home address and telephone number, emergency contact information, social security number, and family member information of a current or former employee or official of a governmental body who requests this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. *See Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1)*. We note section 552.117 is also applicable to personal cellular telephone numbers, provided the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. *See Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-6 (1988)* (section 552.117 not applicable to cellular telephone numbers paid for by governmental body and intended for official use). Whether a particular item of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. *See Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989)*. Thus, information may be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) only on behalf of a current or former employee or official who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. Information may not be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee or official who did not timely request under section 552.024 the information be kept confidential. Therefore, if the individuals whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, then the university must withhold the cellular telephone numbers you have marked, and the additional information we have marked, under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the university may only withhold the marked cellular telephone numbers if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service. Conversely, if the individuals at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024, or a governmental body pays for the cellular telephone service, then the university may not withhold the marked information under section 552.117(a)(1).

In summary, the university may withhold the information you have marked under sections 552.107(1) and 552.111 of the Government Code. The university must withhold the cellular telephone numbers you have marked, and the additional information we have marked, under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the university may only withhold the marked cellular telephone numbers if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service. The university must release the remaining information.

⁵As our ruling is dispositive, we need not consider your remaining argument against disclosure of this 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/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 "N. A. Ybarra".

Nicholas A. Ybarra
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

NAY/cbz

Ref: ID# 577620

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)