



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 29, 2022

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

OR2022-36721

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# 984316 (OGC# 206946).

The University of Texas System (the "system") received a request for information, including specified communications regarding a named employee during a stated period of time.¹ You state you will release some information. We understand the system will redact personal e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).² You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, 552.108, and 552.111 of the

¹ You state the system sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.2d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (if governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification of unclear or over-broad request, ten-day period to request attorney general ruling is measured from date request is clarified or narrowed).

² Open Records Decision No. 684 serves as a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information, including personal e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision. *See* ORD 684.

Government Code.³ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.⁴

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. This section encompasses information protected by other statutes, such as section 551.104 of the Open Meetings Act (the “OMA”), chapter 551 of the Government Code. Section 551.104 of the Government Code provides, in part, “[t]he certified agenda or tape of a closed meeting is available for public inspection and copying only under a court order issued under Subsection (b)(3).” *Id.* § 551.104(c). We note the system is not required to submit a certified agenda of a closed meeting to this office for review. *See* Open Records Decision No. 495 at 4 (1988) (attorney general lacks authority to review certified agendas or tapes of executive sessions to determine whether a governmental body may withhold such information from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.101). Such information cannot be released to a member of the public in response to an open records request. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-995 at 5-6 (1988) (public disclosure of certified agenda of closed meeting may be accomplished only under procedures provided in Open Meetings Act). Section 551.146 of the OMA makes it a criminal offense to disclose a certified agenda or tape recording of a lawfully closed meeting to a member of the public. *See* Gov’t Code § 551.146(a)-(b); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 495 at 4 (1988). Likewise, this office has determined minutes of a closed meeting are confidential. *See* Open Records Decision No. 60 (1974) (closed meeting minutes are confidential under predecessor to section 551.104); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 563 (1990) (minutes of properly held executive session are confidential under Open Meetings Act), 495 (information protected under predecessor to section 551.104 cannot be released to member of public in response to open records request). You state the requested information includes certified agendas of closed meetings. Based on your representations, we agree the system must withhold the requested agendas under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 551.104 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 51.971 of the Education Code. Section 51.971 of the Education Code, provides, in relevant part:

(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:

³ We note the system did not comply with the requirements of section 552.301 of the Government Code in raising section 552.108. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.301(e). Nevertheless, because third-party interests can provide a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness caused by a failure to comply with section 552.301, we will consider whether the submitted information must be withheld on that ground.

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.

(A) ethics and standards of conduct;

(B) financial reporting;

(C) internal accounting controls; or

(D) auditing.

(2) "Institution of higher education" has the meaning assigned by Section 61.003.

...

(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; and

(2) information that directly or indirectly reveals the identity of an individual as a person who is alleged to have or may have planned, initiated, or participated in activities that are the subject of a report made to the compliance program office of an institution of higher education if, after completing an investigation, the office determines the report to be unsubstantiated or without merit.

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

(e) Information is excepted from disclosure under [the Act] if it is collected or produced:

(1) in a compliance program investigation and releasing the information would interfere with an ongoing compliance investigation[.]

Educ. Code § 51.971(a), (c)-(e)(1). You inform us the system is an institution of higher education for purposes of section 61.003 of the Education Code. *See id.* § 51.971(a)(2). You state some of the information at issue relates to a completed compliance investigation conducted by the system regarding allegations involving ethical questions and standards of conduct of a system employee. You state the investigation was conducted in response to allegations of misconduct and was initiated in order to assess and ensure compliance with all applicable laws, rules, regulations, and policies. Based upon these representations and our review, we find the information at issue relates to an investigation conducted under the system's compliance program. *See id.* § 51.971(a)(1).

You assert the information you marked is confidential under section 51.971(c)(1) and section 51.971(c)(2). You assert release of the information at issue would directly or indirectly reveal the identities of individuals making reports to or participating in the closed compliance program investigation at issue. Further, you state release of the information at issue would directly or indirectly reveal the identities of individuals who were alleged to have or may have planned, initiated, or participated in the activities at issue regarding the unsubstantiated allegations. You inform us none of the individuals whose information you marked have consented to release of their information. Upon review, we agree release of the information at issue would directly or indirectly identify individuals as participants in a compliance program investigation or the individuals alleged to have participated in the unsubstantiated alleged activities. *See id.* § 51.971(c). Accordingly, the system must withhold the information you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 51.971(c) of the Education Code.

The system informs us the remaining information at issue was collected or produced in an ongoing system compliance program investigation and asserts release of the information would interfere with that investigation. Based on these representations and our review, we agree the system must withhold the information you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 51.971(e)(1) of the Education Code.

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 demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. *See* ORD 676 at 6-7. 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 consists of communications involving attorneys for the system and system officials and employees in their capacities as clients. You state these communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the system. You state these communications were intended to be, and have remained, confidential. Based on these representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Accordingly, the system may withhold the information you marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.⁵

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)*.

⁵ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

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 seek to withhold portions of the remaining information under section 552.111 of the Government Code. You state the information at issue consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations of system 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 system has demonstrated the information at issue consists of advice, opinions, or recommendations on the policymaking matters of the system. Thus, the system may withhold the information you marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if . . . release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(1). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(1) must explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). Section 552.108 may be invoked by any proper custodian of information relating to a pending investigation or prosecution of criminal conduct. *See* Open Records Decision No. 474 at 4-5 (1987). Where a governmental body has custody of information relating to a pending case of another law enforcement agency, the custodian of records may withhold the information if it provides this office with a demonstration the information relates to a pending criminal case and representation from the law enforcement agency that it wishes to have the information withheld. The system informs us the University Police Department (the “department”) objects to the release of the information at issue because it relates to a pending criminal investigation, and release of the information would interfere with the investigation and prosecution of the case. Based upon this representation, we conclude the release of the information at issue would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See Houston Chronicle Publ’g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases), *writ ref’d n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Thus, section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable to the information at issue. Thus, the system may withhold the information you indicated under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code on behalf of the department.

In summary, the system must withhold the requested agendas under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 551.104 of the Government Code. The system must withhold the information you marked under section 552.101 of the

Government Code in conjunction with section 51.971(c) of the Education Code. The system must withhold the information you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 51.971(e)(1) of the Education Code. The system may withhold the information you marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The system may withhold the information you marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The system may withhold the information you indicated under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code on behalf of the department. The system 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,

D. Michelle Case
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

DMH/mo

Ref: ID# 984316

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)