



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 8, 2019

Ms. Jennifer Burnett
Senior Attorney & Public Information Coordinator
The University of Texas System
210 West 7th Street
Austin, Texas 78701-2901

Ms. Cynthia Tynan
Senior Attorney & Public Information Coordinator
The University of Texas System
210 West 7th Street
Austin, Texas 78701-2901

OR2019-18387

Dear Ms. Burnett, and 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# 773853 (OGC Nos. 190135; 191029; 191030).

The University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center (the "university") received three requests from the same requestor for specified communications and investigative files pertaining to the deaths of two named individuals. The university states it will release some of the requested information to the requestor. The university states it does not have information responsive to a portion of the third request.¹ The university claims some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, 552.108,

¹The Act does not require a governmental body that receives a request for information to create information that did not exist when the request was received. See *Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 563 at 8 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

and 552.111 of the Government Code.² We have considered the exceptions the university claims and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.³

Initially, the university informs us, and we agree, some of the submitted information, which the university has marked, is not responsive to the requests for information because it was either created after the date the university received the request for information at issue, does not pertain to the specified death investigations, or was specifically excluded by the requestor. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp.*, 562 S.W.2d 266; ORDs 605 at 2, 563 at 8, 555 at 1-2, 452 at 3, 362 at 2. This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the request and the university is not required to release such information in response to this request.

Next, we note some of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides, in relevant part, the following:

(a) [T]he following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

(1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). The submitted responsive information includes information that is subject to section 552.022(a)(1). The university must release the information at issue, which we have marked, pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1) unless it is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* The university seeks to withhold this information under section 552.107 of the Government Code. However, section 552.107 is discretionary in nature and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 10-11 (2002) (attorney-client privilege under Gov't Code § 552.107(1) may be waived), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions).* Therefore, the information at issue may not be withheld under

²Although the university initially raised section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 241.051 of the Health and Safety Code for some of the information at issue, the university informs our office it wishes to withdraw its claim under this section. Accordingly, we do not address the university's argument under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 241.051 of the Health and Safety Code.

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 of the Government Code. However, the Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Evidence are “other law” within the meaning of section 552.022. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). Accordingly, we will address the university’s assertion of the attorney-client privilege under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 for the information subject to section 552.022(a)(1).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses information protected by other statutes, including section 161.032 of the Health and Safety Code, which provides, in relevant part:

(a) The records and proceedings of a medical committee are confidential and are not subject to court subpoena.

...

(c) Records, information, or reports of a medical committee, medical peer review committee, or compliance officer and records, information, or reports provided by a medical committee, medical peer review committee, or compliance officer to the governing body of a public hospital, hospital district, or hospital authority are not subject to disclosure under [the Act].

...

(f) This section and Subchapter A, Chapter 160, Occupations Code, do not apply to records made or maintained in the regular course of business by a hospital, health maintenance organization, medical organization, university medical center or health science center, hospital district, hospital authority, or extended care facility.

Health & Safety Code § 161.032(a), (c), (f). A “medical committee” is any committee, including a joint committee of a hospital, medical organization, university medical school or health science center, health maintenance organization, extended care facility, a hospital district, or a hospital authority. *See id.* § 161.031(a). The term also encompasses “a committee appointed *ad hoc* to conduct a specific investigation or established under state or federal law or rule or under the bylaws or rules of the organization or institution.” *Id.* § 161.031(b) (emphasis added).

The precise scope of the “medical committee” provision has been the subject of a number of judicial decisions. *See, e.g., Mem’l Hosp.—The Woodlands v. McCown*, 927 S.W.2d 1 (Tex. 1996); *Barnes v. Whittington*, 751 S.W.2d 493 (Tex. 1988); *Jordan v. Fourth Supreme Judicial Dist.*, 701 S.W.2d 644 (Tex. 1986). These cases establish “documents generated by the committee in order to conduct open and thorough review” are confidential.

Mem'l Hosp., 927 S.W.2d at 10; *Jordan*, 701 S.W.2d at 647-48; *Doctor's Hosp. v. West*, 765 S.W.2d 812, 814 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1988, no writ). This protection extends “to documents that have been prepared by or at the direction of the committee for committee purposes.” *Jordan*, 701 S.W.2d at 647-48. Protection does not extend to documents “gratuitously submitted to a committee” or “created without committee impetus and purpose.” *Id.*; see also Open Records Decision No. 591 (1991) (construing statutory predecessor to Health & Safety Code § 161.032). Additionally, we note section 161.032 does not make confidential “records made or maintained in the regular course of business by a hospital[.]” Health & Safety Code § 161.032(f); see also *Mem'l Hosp.*, 927 S.W.2d at 10 (stating reference to statutory predecessor to section 160.007 of the Occupations Code in section 161.032 is clear signal records should be accorded same treatment under both statutes in determining if they were made in ordinary course of business). The phrase “records made or maintained in the regular course of business” has been construed to mean records that are neither created nor obtained in connection with a medical committee’s deliberative proceedings. See *Mem'l Hosp.*, 927 S.W.2d at 10 (discussing *Barnes*, 751 S.W.2d 493, and *Jordan*, 701 S.W.2d 644).

The university contends portions of the submitted information are subject to section 161.032. The university explains the information it marked consists of records of the university’s Hospital Safety Committee and Controlled Substances Diversion Committee. The university explains these are medical committees whose functions and duties include developing, implementing, and evaluating medical safety programs, and reviewing and evaluating controlled substance policies and procedures. The university states the information at issue was “reviewed or prepared by [these medical committees] in conjunction with each committee’s respective charge” after the deaths of the named individuals. Based on these representations and our review, we conclude the information the university marked consists of privileged records or information of the committees at issue that are subject to section 161.032. Cf. *Texarkana Mem'l Hosp., Inc. v. Jones*, 551 S.W.2d 33, 35 (Tex. 1977) (defining records made or maintained in regular course of business). Therefore, we conclude the university must withhold the information it has marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 161.032 of the Health and Safety Code.

Section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code exempts from disclosure information concerning an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication. See Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(2). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(2) must demonstrate the requested information relates to a criminal investigation that has concluded in a final result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. See *id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must provide comments explaining why exceptions raised should apply to information requested). The university states portions of the remaining responsive information relate to closed criminal investigations conducted by the university’s police department that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication. Based on this representation and our review, we agree section 552.108(a)(2) is applicable to the information the university marked.

However, section 552.108 does not except from disclosure basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime. *Id.* § 552.108(c). Basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle Publishing Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). *See also* Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). Thus, with the exception of the basic information, which must be released, the university may withhold the information it has marked under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code.

Texas Rule of Evidence 503(b)(1) provides as follows:

A client has a privilege to refuse to disclose and to prevent any other person from disclosing confidential communications made to facilitate the rendition of professional legal services to the client:

(A) between the client or the client's representative and the client's lawyer or the lawyer's representative;

(B) between the client's lawyer and the lawyer's representative;

(c) by the client, the client's representative, the client's lawyer, or the lawyer's representative to a lawyer representing another party in a pending action or that lawyer's representative, if the communications concern a matter of common interest in the pending action;

(D) between the client's representatives or between the client and the client's representative; or

(E) among lawyers and their representatives representing the same client.

TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). A communication is "confidential" if it is 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).

Thus, in order to withhold attorney-client privileged information from disclosure under rule 503, a governmental body must (1) show the document is a communication transmitted between privileged parties or reveals a confidential communication; (2) identify the parties involved in the communication; and (3) show the communication is confidential by explaining it was not intended to be disclosed to third persons and it was made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client. Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the information is privileged and confidential under rule 503, provided the client has

not waived the privilege or the document does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in rule 503(d). *Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein); *In re Valero Energy Corp.*, 973 S.W.2d 453, 457 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1998, orig. proceeding) (privilege attaches to complete communication, including factual information).

The university states the information subject to section 552.022(a)(1) consists of communications involving attorneys for the university and university employees and representatives in their capacities as clients. The university states these communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the university. The university states these communications were intended to be, and have remained, confidential. Based on these representations and our review, we find the university has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Accordingly, the university may withhold the information we have marked under rule 503 of The Texas Rules of Evidence.

The university claims section 552.107 of the Government Code for portions of the remaining responsive information. Section 552.107(1) protects information that comes within the attorney-client privilege. The elements of the privilege under section 552.107 are the same as those discussed for rule 503. 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* ORD 676 at 6-7. 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*, 922 S.W.2d at 923.

The university states portions of the remaining responsive information, which it has marked, consist of communications involving attorneys for the university and university employees and representatives in their capacities as clients. The university states these communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the university. The university states these communications were intended to be, and have remained, confidential. Based on these representations and our review, we find the university has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Accordingly, the university may withhold the information it has marked in the remaining responsive information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

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.

The university states the information at issue, which it has marked, "consists of communications between [u]niversity employees concerning matters of policymaking." The university further states some of the information at issue consists of drafts that were intended for release in their final form. Thus, the university states the information at issue consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations of the university pertaining to its policymaking functions. Based on these representations and our review of the information at issue, we find the university has demonstrated portions of the information at issue, which it has marked, consist of advice, opinions, or recommendations on the policymaking matters of the

university. Thus, the university may withhold the information it has marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

In summary, the university must withhold the information it has marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 161.032 of the Health and Safety Code. With the exception of the basic information, which must be released, the university may withhold the information it has marked under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code. The university may withhold the information we have marked under rule 503 of The Texas Rules of Evidence. The university may withhold the information it has marked in the remaining responsive information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The university may withhold the information it has marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The university must release the remaining responsive 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,



Lecelle Clarke
Attorney
Open Records Division

LC/mo

Ref: ID# 773853

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)