



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

January 7, 2022

Mr. Jeffrey D. Palmer
Associate General Counsel
The University of Houston System
4800 Calhoun, Room 311
Houston, Texas 77004

OR2022-00732

Dear Mr. Palmer:

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# 921271 (Ref. No. IR07310).

The University of Houston (the "university") received a request for agreements with a named individual or Paradigm Four ("Paradigm") from a particular time period, as well as communications between certain employees and the named individual from a particular time period.¹ You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.104 and 552.111 of the Government Code. You also state you notified Paradigm of the request for information and of the right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in the Act in certain circumstances). We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) of the Government

¹ The university 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.3d 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).

Code to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received comments from the notified third party explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude the notified third party has a protected proprietary interest in the submitted information. *See, e.g., id.* § 552.110 (requiring the provision of specific factual evidence demonstrating the applicability of the exception). Accordingly, the university may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest the notified third party may have in the information.

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[.]” *Id.* § 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.

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.

You state the information at issue consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations of employees of the university and a consultant, who was hired by the university to provide advice related to the university's athletic department's "strategy, brand and market intelligence, crisis management, and media relations[.]" We understand some of the information at issue consists of draft documents that were intended to be released in their final forms. Upon review, we find the university may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code.² However, we find the remaining information at issue consists of information that is administrative or purely factual in nature, does not pertain to policymaking, or was received from or sent to individuals 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 any portion of the remaining information at issue under section 552.111 of the Government Code on the basis of the deliberative process privilege.

Section 552.104(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information that a governmental body demonstrates, if released, would "harm its interests by providing an advantage to a competitor or bidder in a particular ongoing competitive situation or in a particular competitive situation where the governmental body establishes the situation at issue is set to reoccur or there is a specific and demonstrable intent to enter into the competitive situation again in the future." Gov't Code § 552.104(a). The "test under section 552.104 is whether knowing another bidder's [or competitor's information] would be an advantage, not whether it would be a decisive advantage." *Boeing Co. v. Paxton*, 466 S.W.3d 831, 841 (Tex. 2015). You state the remaining information in Exhibit 2A consists of e-mails and attachments between the university and an outside consultant containing "advice and consultation regarding [the university's] methods and strategies utilized for [the university's] [a]thletic [d]epartment." You further state the detailed information relates to "confidential and sensitive matters, including internal strategies, press statements, and crisis management." You assert the university has specific marketplace interests in the information at issue because it competes with other universities in the "highly competitive

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

arena of college athletics.” You argue release of the information at issue would allow a competing university to “use the same strategies with its athletics programs to the detriment of the [u]niversity.” Based upon your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the university has specific marketplace interests and may be considered a “competitor” for purposes of section 552.104. We also find you have demonstrated release of some of the information at issue would give advantage to a competitor or bidder. Accordingly, the university may withhold the information we have marked in Exhibit 2A under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code. However, we find the university has failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.104 to the remaining information at issue. Thus, the university may not withhold the remaining information at issue under section 552.104(a).

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the current and former home addresses and telephone numbers, emergency contact information, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former employees of a governmental body who request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code.³ Gov’t Code § 552.117(a)(1). Section 552.117(a)(1) also applies to the personal cellular telephone number of a current or former official or employee of a governmental body, provided the cellular telephone service is not paid by a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-6 (1988). Whether a particular piece of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time the request for it is made. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Therefore, a governmental body must withhold information under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee only if the individual made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for this information was made. Therefore, if the cell phone numbers in the remaining information belong to university employees who timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code and the cellular telephone services are not paid for by a governmental body, the university must withhold the cellular telephone numbers belonging to university employees in the remaining information under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code.

We note some of the remaining information appears to be protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; *see* Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit.

In summary, 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

³ 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).

marked under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code. If the cell phone numbers in the remaining information belong to university employees who timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code and the cellular telephone services are not paid for by a governmental body, the university must withhold the cellular telephone numbers belonging to university employees in the remaining information under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The university must release the remaining information; however, any information subject to copyright may only be released in accordance with copyright law.

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,

Erin Groff
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

EMG/jm

Ref: ID# 921271

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Third Party
(w/o enclosures)