



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 21, 2022

Ms. Jennifer Burnett
Assistant General Counsel and Public Information Coordinator
The University of Texas System
210 West 7th Street
Austin, Texas 78701-2903

OR2022-21389

Dear Ms. Burnett:

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# 961418 (OGC# 206061).

The University of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston (the "university") received a request for specified correspondence involving specified keywords during a particular timeframe.¹ The university states it will release some information. You assert some of the submitted information is not subject to the Act. You also state the university will redact certain information under sections 552.024(c) and 552.136(c) of the Government Code, as well as Open Records Letter No. 2016-10386 (2016).² You claim some of the submitted

¹ You state the university sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also* *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or overbroad request for information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

² Section 552.117 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, emergency contact information, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body. *See* Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). Section 552.024 of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to withhold information subject to section 552.117 without requesting a decision from this office if the current or former employee or official chooses not to allow public access to the information. *See id.* § 552.024(c)(2). Section 552.136(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 552.136(b) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See id.* § 552.136(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.136(e). *See id.* § 552.136(d), (e). Open Records Letter No. 2016-10386 authorizes the university to withhold the dates of birth of current and

information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, 552.111, and 552.139 of the Government Code.³ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.⁴

Initially, you assert the University of Texas Electronic Identification Number (“UTEID”) contained in the submitted documents is not subject to the Act. The Act applies only to “public information.” *See* Gov’t Code § 552.021. Section 552.002(a) defines “public information” as:

[I]nformation that is written, produced, collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business:

(1) by a governmental body;

(2) for a governmental body and the governmental body:

(A) owns the information;

(B) has a right of access to the information; or

(C) spends or contributes public money for the purpose of writing, producing, collecting, assembling, or maintaining the information; or

(3) by an individual officer or employee of a governmental body in the officer’s or employee’s official capacity and the information pertains to official business of the governmental body.

Id. § 552.002(a). In Open Records Decision No. 581 (1990), this office determined certain computer information, such as source codes, documentation information, and other computer programming, that has no significance other than its use as a tool for the maintenance, manipulation, or protection of public property is not the kind of information made public under section 552.021 of the Government Code. We understand, when combined with an individual’s password, a UTEID serves as the required log-on protocol to access the computer mainframe, which is the university’s centralized hub that runs all its

former employees held in an employment context under section 552.102 of the Government Code without requesting a decision from this office.

³ We note, and you acknowledge, the university did not comply with section 552.301 of the Government Code with respect to a portion of the submitted information in requesting a ruling from this office. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.301(b), (e). Nonetheless, because section 552.101 of the Government Code can provide a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness, we will consider its applicability to the submitted information. *See id.* §§ 552.007, .302, .352.

⁴ 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 that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

high-level electronic functions. We understand the UTEID is used solely to access the university's computer mainframe and it has no other significance other than its use as a tool for the maintenance, manipulation, or protection of public information. Thus, we find the UTEID contained in the information at issue, which you marked, does not constitute public information under section 552.002 of the Government Code. Accordingly, we conclude the UTEID is not subject to the Act and the university need not release it.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." *Id.* § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses section 51.914 of the Education Code, which provides, in relevant part, the following:

(a) In order to protect the actual or potential value, the following information is confidential and is not subject to disclosure under [the Act], or otherwise:

(1) all information relating to a product, device, or process, the application or use of such a product, device, or process, and all technological and scientific information (including computer programs) developed in whole or in part at a state institution of higher education, regardless of whether patentable or capable of being registered under copyright or trademark laws, that have a potential for being sold, traded, or licensed for a fee; [or]

(2) any information relating to a product, device, or process, the application or use of such product, device, or process, and any technological and scientific information (including computer programs) that is the proprietary information of a person, partnership, corporation, or federal agency that has been disclosed to an institution of higher education solely for the purposes of a written research contract or grant that contains a provision prohibiting the institution of higher education from disclosing such proprietary information to third persons or parties[.]

...

(b) Information maintained by or for an institution of higher education that would reveal the institution's plans or negotiations for commercialization or a proposed research agreement, contract, or grant, or that consists of unpublished research or data that may be commercialized, is not subject to [the Act], unless the information has been published, is patented, or is otherwise subject to an executed license, sponsored research agreement, or research contract or grant. In this subsection, "institution of higher education" has the meaning assigned by Section 61.003 [of the Education Code].

Educ. Code § 51.914(a)(1)-(2), (b). As noted in Open Records Decision No. 651 (1997), the legislature is silent as to how this office or a court is to determine whether particular

scientific information has “a potential for being sold, traded, or licensed for a fee.” ORD 651 at 9-10. Furthermore, whether particular scientific information has such a potential is a question of fact that this office is unable to resolve in the opinion process. *See id.* at 10. Thus, this office has stated in considering whether requested information has “a potential for being sold, traded, or licensed for a fee,” we will rely on a governmental body’s assertion that the information has this potential. *See id.* However, a governmental body’s determination that information has a potential for being sold, traded, or licensed for a fee is subject to judicial review. *See id.* We note section 51.914 is not applicable to working titles of experiments or other information that does not reveal the details of the research. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 557 at 3 (1990), 497 at 6-7 (1988).*

You assert the university is an institution of higher education. *See Educ. Code § 61.003(8).* You assert the information you marked consists of unpublished research data and scientific information concerning a university research project. You also inform us the information at issue has the potential to be sold, traded, or licensed for a fee. Based on these representations, we conclude the university must withhold the information you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 51.914(a)(1) of the Education Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 161.032 of the Health and Safety Code, which provides, in relevant part, the following:

(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].

Health & Safety Code § 161.032(a), (c). For purposes of this confidentiality provision, a “medical committee” includes any committee, including a joint committee, of . . . a hospital [or] a medical organization [or] a university medical school or health science center [or] a hospital district[.]” *Id.* § 161.031(a). Section 161.0315 provides in relevant part that “[t]he governing body of a hospital, medical organization, university medical school or health science center [or] hospital district . . . may form . . . a medical committee, as defined by section 161.031, to evaluate medical and health care services[.]” *Id.* § 161.0315(a).

The precise scope of the “medical committee” provision has been the subject of a number of judicial decisions. *See, e.g., Memorial 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 that “documents generated by the committee in order to conduct open and thorough review” are confidential. 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.* at 648; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 591 (1991) (construing, among other statutes, statutory predecessor to section 161.032). Further, section 161.032 does not make confidential “records made or maintained in the regular course of business by a . . . university medical center or health science center[.]” Health & Safety Code § 161.032(f); *see also McCown*, 927 S.W.2d at 10 (stating reference to statutory predecessor to section 160.007 of the Occupations Code in section 161.032 of the Health and Safety Code 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 McCown*, 927 S.W.2d at 9-10.

You assert the information you marked consists of records of the university’s Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (“IACUC”) and is thus confidential under section 161.032 as records of a medical committee. You state the “IACUC is charged with overseeing the welfare and humane treatment of animal research subjects.” You inform us that the IACUC is also “responsible for evaluating the care, treatment, housing and use of animals and for certifying compliance with the Animal Welfare Act and the Public Health Service Policy.” Further, you state the information at issue was created by or at the direction of the IACUC for committee purposes. Based upon your representations and our review, we agree the IACUC constitutes a “medical committee” as defined by section 161.031 and conclude the information you marked must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 161.032 of the Health and Safety Code. *See* Health & Safety Code § 161.031(a); *see also Jordan*, 701 S.W.2d at 648 (court found privilege extends to minutes of committee meetings, correspondence between members relating to deliberation process, and any final committee product).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the Texas Homeland Security Act (the “HSA”). Sections 418.176 through 418.182 were added to chapter 418 of the Government Code as part of the HSA. Section 418.181 provides as follows:

Those documents or portions of documents in the possession of a governmental entity are confidential if they identify the technical details of particular vulnerabilities of critical infrastructure to an act of terrorism.

Gov’t Code § 418.181. Section 418.182 provides, in relevant part,

(a) [I]nformation, including access codes and passwords, in the possession of a governmental entity that relates to the specifications, operating procedures, or location of a security system used to protect public or private property from an act of terrorism or related criminal activity is confidential.

Id. § 418.182(a). The fact that information may relate to a governmental body’s security concerns does not make the information *per se* confidential under the HSA. *See* Open Records Decision No. 649 at 3 (1996) (language of confidentiality provision controls scope

of its protection). 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 state the information you indicated reveals technical details of the university's Galveston National Laboratory (the "lab"). The university argues the information at issue consists of information that would "[reveal] the detailed process by which electronic access to the [lab] is sought and granted." You assert, and we agree, the lab constitutes critical infrastructure for the purposes of section 418.181. *See generally id.* § 421.001. You argue release of the information at issue would allow criminals to undermine the collective efforts of the university and law enforcement agencies to safeguard the welfare of students, faculty, staff, and members of the public. Further, you assert its release would undermine the security of the university and expose vulnerabilities to the university's critical infrastructure to an act of terrorism. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated release of some of the information at issue would identify the technical details of particular vulnerabilities of the university to an act of terrorism. Thus, the university must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.181 of the Government Code. However, upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information consists of information that is confidential under section 418.181 or section 418.182 of the Government Code. Therefore, the university may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.181 or section 418.182 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information protected by section 801.353 of the Occupations Code, which provides, in relevant part, the following:

(a) A veterinarian may not violate the confidential relationship between the veterinarian and the veterinarian's client.

(b) A veterinarian may not be required to release information concerning the veterinarian's care of an animal, except on the veterinarian's receipt of:

(1) a written authorization or other form of waiver executed by the client; or

(2) an appropriate court order or subpoena.

Occ. Code § 801.353(a), (b). Section 801.353 limits a veterinarian's release of information concerning the veterinarian's care of an animal to certain circumstances. *See id.* You state the information you have marked consists of veterinary records of veterinarians employed by the university. You inform us the university is the owner of the animals at issue and does not consent to the disclosure of the animals' records. *See id.* § 801.351(a)(1) (defining "client" as "owner or other caretaker of the animal"). Further, you state the requestor has

not produced an appropriate court order or subpoena to release the information at issue. Based on these representations and our review, we conclude the information at issue consists of veterinary record information that is subject to chapter 801 of the Occupations Code. Accordingly, the university must withhold the information you have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 801.353 of the Occupations Code.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information subject to the attorney-client privilege. *See* Gov't Code § 552.107(1). 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). 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. *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 marked constitutes a communication between a university attorney and university employees that was made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the university. You also state the communication was intended to be confidential and has remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find the university may withhold the information you marked 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 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 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 marked consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations of university employees. You further state the information at issue includes a draft document that was intended to be released to the public in its final form. Accordingly, the university may withhold the information you marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Section 552.139 of the Government Code provides, in relevant part, the following:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information that relates to computer network security, to restricted information under Section 2059.055 [of the Government Code], or to the design, operation, or defense of a computer network.

(b) The following is confidential:

(1) a computer network vulnerability report;

(2) any other assessment of the extent to which data processing operations, a computer, a computer program, network, system, or system interface, or software of a governmental body or of a contractor of a governmental body is vulnerable to unauthorized access or harm, including an assessment of the extent to which the governmental body's or contractor's electronically stored information containing sensitive or critical information is vulnerable to alteration, damage, erasure, or inappropriate use;

(3) a photocopy or other copy of an identification badge issued to an official or employee of a governmental body; and

(4) information directly arising from a governmental body's routine efforts to prevent, detect, investigate, or mitigate a computer security incident, including information contained in or derived from an information security log.

Gov't Code § 552.139(a)-(b). You to assert some of the remaining information is made confidential under section 552.139. However, upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.139 to any of the remaining information. Therefore, the university may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.139(a) of the Government Code.

In summary, we conclude the UTEID is not subject to the Act and the university need not release it. The university must withhold the information you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 51.914(a)(1) of the Education Code. The university must withhold the information you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 161.032 of the Health and Safety Code. The university must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.181 of the Government Code. The university must withhold the information you have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 801.353 of the Occupations Code. The university may withhold the information you marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The university may withhold the information you marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. 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 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,

Chase D. Young
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CDY/be

Ref: ID# 961418

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)