



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 29, 2020

Ms. Cecilia M. Alvarez
Assistant General Counsel
The University of Houston System
4302 University Drive, Suite 311
Houston, Texas 77204-2028

OR2020-14962

Dear Ms. Alvarez:

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# 830462 (Ref. No. IR06306).

The University of Houston (the "university") received a request for nine categories of specified contracts and communications. You claim portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.111 of the Government Code. Additionally, you provide documentation showing the university has notified an individual of the right to submit comments to this office why some of the submitted information should not be released.¹ *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released). We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.² We have also received and considered comments from the requestor. *See id.*

Initially, we must address the requestor's assertion the university failed to comply with section 552.301 of the Government Code in requesting this decision. Section 552.301 describes the procedural obligations placed on a governmental body that receives a written request for information it wishes to withhold. Pursuant to section 552.301(b), the

¹ As of the date of this letter, this office has not received comments from any third party explaining why any of the submitted information should not be released.

² 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.

governmental body must ask for the attorney general's decision and state the exceptions that apply within ten business days after receiving the request. *See id.* § 552.301(a), (b). You state, and provide documentation showing, the university received the request for information on January 13, 2020. Additionally, you state, and provide documentation showing, the university sought clarification of the information requested on January 27, 2020, and received a response from the requestor on February 3, 2020. Further, we note, in response to a cost estimate, the requestor modified his request on February 18, 2020. *See id.* § 552.222 (providing if information requested is unclear to governmental body or if large amount of information has been requested, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify or narrow request, but may not inquire into purpose for which information will be used); *see also City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding 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). We also note the university sent the requestor a cost estimate of charges pursuant to section 552.2615 of the Government Code and the requestor accepted the cost estimate. *See Gov't Code* § 552.2615. The estimate of charges required the requestor to provide a deposit for payment of anticipated costs under section 552.263 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.263(a). You inform us the university received payment for the charges on March 10, 2020. *See id.* §§ 552.2615, .263(a), (e) (if governmental body requires deposit or bond for anticipated costs pursuant to section 552.263, request for information is considered to have been received on date governmental body receives bond or deposit). Accordingly, the university's ten-business-day deadline for requesting a ruling from this office was March 24, 2020. The envelope in which the university provided the information required by section 552.301(b) was postmarked March 24, 2020. *See id.* § 552.301(a)(1) (describing rules for calculating submission dates of documents sent via first class United States mail, common or contract carrier, or interagency mail). Therefore, we find the university complied with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 of the Government Code in requesting this decision.

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:

(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[.]

Id. § 552.022(a)(1). The submitted information includes a completed report that is subject to section 552.022(a)(1). The university must release the completed report 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.* You seek to withhold the information subject to section 552.022(a)(1) under section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, section 552.111 is discretionary in nature and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 677 (2002)*

(governmental body may waive attorney work product privilege under section 552.111), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions), 470 at 7 (1987) (statutory predecessor to section 552.111 subject to waiver). Therefore, the university may not withhold the information subject to section 552.022, which we have marked, under section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, because section 552.137 of the Government Code makes information confidential under the Act, we will consider the applicability of section 552.137 for the information at issue.³ We will also consider your argument under section 552.111 for the information not subject to section 552.022.

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

³ The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470.

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 some of the submitted information 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 a draft document which reflects the deliberations of the university's staff. However, you do not explain whether the draft document was intended to be released in its final form. Thus, with respect to this information, we must rule conditionally. To the extent the draft document at issue will be released to the public in its final form, the university may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. To the extent the draft document will not be released to the public in its final form, the university may not withhold the marked information under section 552.111. Nevertheless, we find portions of the information at issue consist of advice opinions, or recommendations on the policymaking matters of the university. Accordingly, we find the university may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, we find the remaining information at issue consists of information that is administrative or purely factual in nature. Thus, you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information reveals advice, opinions, or recommendations that pertain to policymaking. Accordingly, the university may not withhold any portion of the remaining information at issue under section 552.111 of the Government Code on the basis of the deliberate process privilege.

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home address and telephone number, emergency contact information, social security number, and family member information of a current or former employee or official of a governmental body who requests this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. *See Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1)*. We note section 552.117 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). Whether a particular item of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. *See Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989)*. Thus, information may be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) only on behalf of a current or former employee or official who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. Information may not be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee or official who did not timely request under section 552.024 the information be kept confidential. Therefore, to the extent the individuals whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the university must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the marked cellular telephone numbers may be withheld only if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular

telephone service.⁴ Conversely, to the extent the individuals at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024, the university may not withhold the marked information under section 552.117(a)(1).

Section 552.137 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body” unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). See Gov’t Code § 552.137(a)-(c). Section 552.137 is not applicable to an institutional e-mail address, an Internet website address, an e-mail address that a governmental entity maintains for one of its officials or employees, or a personal e-mail address belonging to a university employee or official used to conduct official government business. See *Austin Bulldog v. Leffingwell*, 490 S.W.3d 240 (Tex. App.—Austin 2016, no pet.) (holding personal e-mail addresses of government officials used to conduct official government business are not e-mail addresses of “members of the public” for purposes of section 552.137(a)). Because we are unable to discern whether the e-mail addresses within the responsive documents belong to university employees or officials or fall within the scope of section 552.137(c), we must rule conditionally. To the extent the e-mail addresses at issue belong to members of the public, the university must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the individuals to whom the e-mail addresses belong affirmatively consent to their release. See Gov’t Code § 552.137(b). However, to the extent the e-mail addresses at issue are excluded by subsection 552.137(c) or belong to a university employee or official, the e-mail addresses may not be withheld under section 552.137 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.” *Id.* § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. This office has found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally highly intimate or embarrassing. See Open Records Decision Nos. 523 (1989) (common-law privacy protects credit reports, financial statements, and other personal financial information), 373 (1983) (sources of income not related to financial transaction between individual and governmental body protected under common-law privacy). Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. See Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). However, this office has concluded the public has a legitimate interest in information that relates to public employees and their conduct in the workplace. See, e.g., Open Records Decision Nos. 562 at 10 (1990) (personnel file information does not involve most intimate aspects of human affairs but in fact touches on matters of legitimate public concern), 470 at 4 (job performance does not generally constitute public

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

employee's private affairs), 444 at 3 (1986) (public has obvious interest in information concerning qualifications and performance of government employees), 405 at 2 (1983) (manner in which public employee's job was performed cannot be said to be of minimal public interest), 392 (1982) (reasons for employee's resignation ordinarily not private). Upon review, we find some of the remaining information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the university must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find you have failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the university may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, to the extent the draft document at issue will be released to the public in its final form, the university may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The university may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. To the extent the individuals whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the university must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the marked cellular telephone numbers may be withheld only if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service. To the extent the e-mail addresses at issue belong to members of the public, the university must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the individuals to whom the e-mail addresses belong affirmatively consent to their release. The university must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. 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,

Alexandra C. Burks
Attorney
Open Records Division

ACB/rm

Ref: ID# 830462

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Third Party
(w/o enclosures)