



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 21, 2022

Ms. Cynthia Tynan
Assistant General Counsel & Public Information Coordinator
The University of Texas System
210 West 7th Street
Austin, Texas 78701-2903

OR2022-36326

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# 986864 (OGC Nos. 207207 and 207208).

The University of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston (the "university") received two requests from the same requestor for all correspondence between named individuals during a specified time period. You state you will release some information to the requestor. You claim portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, 552.108, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This section encompasses section 51.971 of the Education Code, which provides, in relevant part, the following:

(a) In this section:

(1) "Compliance program" means a process to assess and ensure compliance by the officers and employees of an institution of higher education with applicable laws, rules, regulations, and policies, including matters of:

(A) ethics and standards of conduct;

- (B) financial reporting;
- (C) internal accounting controls; or
- (D) auditing.

...

(c) The following are confidential:

- (1) information that directly or indirectly reveals the identity of an individual who made a report to the compliance program office of an institution of higher education, sought guidance from the office, or participated in an investigation conducted under the compliance program[.]

...

(d) Subsection (c) does not apply to information related to an individual who consents to disclosure of the information.

Educ. Code § 51.971(a), (c)(1), (d). You inform us the university is an institution of higher education for purposes of section 61.003 of the Education Code. *See id.* § 51.971(a)(2). You state the information you have indicated relates to a completed compliance investigation concerning personnel matters conducted by the University of Texas System's Office of Systemwide Compliance. You further state the investigation was initiated in order to assess and ensure compliance with all applicable laws, rules, regulations, and policies. Upon review, we agree the information at issue relates to an investigation conducted under the university's compliance program. *See id.* § 51.971(a).

You state the university completed the investigation at issue. You assert the information at issue is confidential in its entirety due to the targeted nature of the request. Accordingly, you assert release of the information at issue would directly or indirectly identify the individuals participating in the compliance program investigation at issue. We have no indication the relevant individuals at issue consented to release of their information. *See id.* § 51.971(d). Based on these representations and our review, we agree the university must withhold the information you have indicated in its entirety under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 51.971(c)(1) of the Education Code.¹

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within 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

¹ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

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 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 the information you have indicated consists of communications between university attorneys and employees that were made for the purpose of providing legal services to the university. You state the communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find the information at issue consists of privileged attorney-client communications. Therefore, the university may withhold the information you have indicated 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*

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

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).

You seek to withhold the remaining information you have indicated under section 552.111 of the Government Code. You state the information at issue consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations of university employees regarding policymaking matters. Upon review, we find the university may withhold the remaining information you have indicated under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

In summary, the university: (1) must withhold the information you have indicated in its entirety under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 51.971(c)(1) of the Education Code; (2) may withhold the information you have indicated under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code; (3) may withhold the remaining information you have indicated under section 552.111 of the Government Code; and (4) 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,

Tim Neal
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

TN/pt

Ref: ID# 986864

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)