



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 22, 2022

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

OR2022-11744

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# 942993 (OGC Nos. 204303 and 204313).

The University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center (the "university") received two requests from different requestors for certain information pertaining to a specified request for proposals. You state the university has released some of the requested information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.111 of the Government Code. You also state you notified TDIndustries, Inc. ("TDI") of the requests for information and of its 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 received comments from TDI. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

TDI raises section 552.104 of the Government Code for a portion of its information. Section 552.104 excepts from disclosure information "if a governmental body demonstrates that release of the information 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) (emphasis added). In *Boeing Co. v. Paxton*, 466 S.W.3d 831 (Tex. 2015), the Texas Supreme Court held section 552.104 does not preclude third parties from raising section 552.104 as an exception to

disclosure. *See Boeing*, 466 S.W.3d at 842. However, the Eighty-sixth Legislature has amended section 552.104 since the issuance of *Boeing*. *See Act of May 25, 2019, 86th Leg., R.S., S.B. 943, § 3*. Section 552.104 now expressly limits the protections of section 552.104 to governmental bodies. Gov't Code § 552.104(a). Therefore, we do not address TDI's arguments under section 552.104 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[.]” *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)*.

You seek to withhold the submitted bid tabulations 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 information you marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

We note some of the remaining information is subject to section 2261.253 of the Government Code. Section 2261.253 provides, in relevant part, as follows:

(a) For each contract for the purchase of goods or services from a private vendor, each state agency shall post on its Internet website:

(1) each contract the agency enters into, including contracts entered into without inviting, advertising for, or otherwise requiring competitive bidding before selection of the contractor, until the contract expires or is completed[.]

Gov't Code § 2261.253(a)(1). The contract at issue is between the university, a state agency, and TDI, a private vendor, for the purchase of goods or services. Further, the contract has neither expired nor been completed. Accordingly, we find the submitted contract is a contract described by section 2261.253.

TDI raises section 552.110 of the Government Code for the submitted contract. Section 552.0222 of the Government Code provides, in relevant part:

(b) The exceptions to disclosure provided by Sections 552.110 and 552.1101 do not apply to the following types of contracting information:

(1) a contract described by Section 2261.253(a), excluding any information that was properly redacted under Subsection (e) of that section[.]

Id. § 552.0222(b)(1). As noted above, the submitted contract is a contract described by section 2261.253(a) of the Government Code. Additionally, we have no indication any portion of the information at issue was properly redacted under section 2261.253(e). Although TDI raises section 552.110, section 552.0222 expressly states this exception does not apply to a contract described by section 2261.253(a). Accordingly, we do not address TDI's arguments against disclosure of the submitted contract under this exception.

Section 552.136(b) of the Government Code provides, "[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential."¹ *Id.* § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining "access device"). Upon review, we find the university must withhold the bank account number in the remaining information under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, the university may withhold the information you indicated under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The university must withhold the bank account number in the remaining information under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The university must release the remaining information.

¹ 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).

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,

Emily Kunst
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

EK/eb

Ref: ID# 942993

c: 2 Requestors

Third Party