



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 18, 2020

Mr. Renaldo Stowers
Senior Associate General Counsel
University of North Texas
Account Number 62048
1155 Union Circle #310907
Denton, Texas 76203-5017

OR2020-28959

Dear Mr. Stowers:

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# 854477 (UNT PIR No. 007983).

The University of North Texas (the "university") received a request for information related to the Chinese Scholarship Council. You state you will make some of the requested information available to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, 552.111, and 552.139 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

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. *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 "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

¹ 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.

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, and lawyer representatives. 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: (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. *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 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 state Sample C consists of communications involving attorneys for the university and university employees and officials 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 Sample C under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.²

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.*

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

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.

Section 552.111 can also encompass communications between a governmental body and a third party, including a consultant or other party with a privity of interest. *See* Open Records Decision No. 561 at 9 (1990) (section 552.111 encompasses communications with party with which governmental body has privity of interest or common deliberative process). For section 552.111 to apply, the governmental body must identify the third party and explain the nature of its relationship with the governmental body. Section 552.111 is not applicable to a communication between the governmental body and a third party unless the governmental body establishes it has a privity of interest or common deliberative process with the third party. *See* ORD 561. We note a governmental body does not share a privity of interest with a third party when the governmental body and the third party are involved in contract negotiations, as the parties' interests are adverse.

You seek to withhold Samples D and E under section 552.111 of the Government Code. You state the information at issue consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations of university employees and officials regarding policymaking matters. You also state the information at issue includes draft documents that will be released to the public in their final forms. Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we

find the university has demonstrated portions of the information at issue, which we have marked, consist of advice, opinions, or recommendations on the policymaking matters of the university. Thus, the university may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code.³ However, we find some of the remaining information consists of information that is administrative or purely factual in nature or does not pertain to policymaking. Further, some of the remaining information was received from an individual with whom you have not demonstrated the university shares a privity of interest or common deliberative process. Thus, you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information reveals advice, opinions, or recommendations that pertain to policymaking. Accordingly, the university may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. The university asserts some of the submitted information is confidential under the provisions found in section 552(b)(7)(A) of the Freedom of Information Act (“FOIA”), section 552 of title 5 of the United States. Generally, FOIA applies only to federal agencies and does not apply to records held by state agencies. ORD 561 at 6. Section 552(b)(7)(A) of FOIA exempts records or information compiled for law enforcement purposes to the extent production of such law enforcement records or information could reasonably be expected to interfere with enforcement proceedings. *See* 5 U.S.C. § 552(b)(7)(A). Information in the possession of a governmental body of the State of Texas is not confidential or excepted from disclosure merely because the same information is or would be confidential in the hands of a federal agency. *See, e.g.*, Attorney General Opinion MW-95; Open Records Decision No. 124 (1976).

However, this office has repeatedly held that the transfer of confidential information between governmental agencies does not destroy the confidentiality of that information. Attorney General Opinions H-917 (1976), H-836 (1974), Open Records Decision Nos. 561, 414 (1984), 388 (1983), 272 (1981), 183 (1978). These opinions recognize the need to maintain an unrestricted flow of information between state agencies. In Open Records Decision No. 561, we considered whether the same rule applied regarding information deemed confidential by a federal agency. In the interests of comity between state and federal authorities and to ensure the flow of information from federal agencies to Texas governmental bodies, we concluded “when information in the possession of a federal agency is ‘deemed confidential’ by federal law, such confidentiality is not destroyed by the sharing of the information with a governmental body in Texas. In such an instance, section 552.101 requires a local government to respect the confidentiality imposed on the information by federal law.” ORD 561 at 7.

You state the remaining information contains information the Federal Bureau of Investigations (the “FBI”) shared with the university. Upon review, we find portions of the remaining information in Sample A were provided to the university by the FBI and are confidential under section 552(b)(7) of title 5 of the United States Code. Therefore, the

³ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

university must withhold the information we have marked in Sample A under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with federal law. However, we find the remaining information at issue is contained in the records of the university, is maintained by the university in relation to the official business of the university, and the information contains no indication the FBI considers the information to be confidential. Accordingly, the university may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with federal law.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information made confidential by other statutes, such as section 418.177 of the Government Code, which was added to chapter 418 of the Government Code as part of the Texas Homeland Security Act (the “HSA”). Section 418.177 provides that information is confidential if it:

- (1) is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental entity for the purpose of preventing, detecting, or investigating an act of terrorism or related criminal activity; and
- (2) relates to an assessment by or for a governmental entity, or an assessment that is maintained by a governmental entity, of the risk or vulnerability of persons or property, including critical infrastructure, to an act of terrorism or related criminal activity.

Gov’t Code § 418.177. The fact that information may relate to a governmental body’s security measures does not make the information *per se* confidential under the HSA. *See* Open Records Decision No. 649 (1996). Furthermore, the mere recitation by a governmental body of a statute’s key terms is not sufficient to demonstrate the applicability of a claimed provision. As with any exception to disclosure, a governmental body asserting one of the confidentiality provisions of the HSA must adequately explain how the responsive records fall within the scope of the claimed provision. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must explain how claimed exception to disclosure applies).

You explain Sample B consists of communications between members of the university’s Computer Emergency Response Team (the “CERT”). You explain the CERT is deployed “when necessary to protect IT high impact information resource[s].” Additionally, you state the information at issue identifies “the information the [CERT] looks for when disabling access and [assessing] whether there have been security breaches, and the tools they use to assess IT security and the file path or location where certain confidential information is stored.” You further state release of the information at issue “would reveal strengths and weaknesses in the university’s security infrastructure.” Based on these representations and our review, we find the submitted information was collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental entity for the purpose of preventing, detecting, or investigating an act of terrorism or related criminal activity and relates to an assessment of the risk or vulnerability of persons or property to an act of terrorism or related criminal activity. *See id.* § 418.177. Accordingly, the university must withhold Sample B

under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.177 of the Government Code.⁴

We note a portion of the remaining information may be subject to section 552.1175 of the Government Code.⁵ Section 552.1175 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home address, home telephone number, emergency contact information, date of birth, social security number, and family member information of certain individuals, when that information is held by a governmental body in a non-employment capacity and the individual elects to keep the information confidential. *Id.* § 552.1175. We note section 552.1175 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). Therefore, if the information we have marked belongs to an individual to whom section 552.1175(a) applies and the individual elects to restrict access to the information in accordance with section 552.1175(b), then the university must withhold the information we have marked if the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. Conversely, if the individual at issue is not a type of individual to whom section 552.1175(a) applies, does not elect to restrict access to the information in accordance with section 552.1175(b), or the marked cellular telephone number is paid for by a governmental body, then the university may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.1175.

In summary, the university may withhold Sample C under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The university may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The university must withhold the information we have marked in Sample A under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with federal law. The university must withhold Sample B under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.177 of the Government Code. If the information we have marked relates to an individual to whom section 552.1175(a) of the Government Code applies and the individual elects to restrict access to the information in accordance with section 552.1175(b), then the university must withhold the information we have marked if the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. The university must release the remaining 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

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

⁵ The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

Mr. Renaldo Stowers - Page 7

responsibilities, please visit our website at <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open-government/members-public/what-expect-after-ruling-issued> or call the OAG's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Public Information Act may be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the OAG, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

Erin Groff
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

EMG/rm

Ref: ID# 854477

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)