



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

January 11, 2016

Ms. Tiffany Evans
Assistant City Attorney
City of Houston
P.O. Box 368
Houston, Texas 77001-0368

OR2016-00823

Dear Ms. Evans:

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# 595462 (GC No. 22769).

The City of Houston (the "city") received a request for all requests for proposals issued to investment banks during 2013, 2014, and 2015, as well as the pitch books and formal presentations provided to the controller's office in response to those requests for proposals. You claim the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 through 552.151 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim.

Initially, we note the requestor seeks information related to requests for proposals issued to investment banks during 2015. It is implicit in several provisions of the Act that the Act applies only to information already in existence. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.002, .021, .227, .351. The Act does not require a governmental body to prepare new information in response to a request. *See* Attorney General Opinion H-90 (1973); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 572 at 1 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990), 452 at 2-3 (1986), 87 (1975). Consequently, a governmental body is not required to comply with a standing request to supply information prepared in the future. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-48 at 2 (1983); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 476 at 1 (1987), 465 at 1 (1987). Thus, the only information encompassed by the present request consists of information the city maintained or had a right of access to as of the date it received the request.

Next, we must address the city's procedural obligations under section 552.301 of the Government Code when requesting a decision from this office under the Act. Pursuant to section 552.301(e), a governmental body must submit to this office within fifteen business days of receiving an open records request (1) written comments stating the reasons why the stated exceptions apply that would allow the information to be withheld, (2) a copy of the written request for information, (3) a signed statement or sufficient evidence showing the date the governmental body received the written request, and (4) a copy of the specific information requested or representative samples, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the documents. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e). You state the city received the request for information on October 23, 2015. However, as of the date of this letter, the city has not submitted for our review written comments stating the reasons why the stated exceptions apply or a copy or representative sample of the information requested. Consequently, we find the city failed to comply with section 552.301 of the Government Code.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with section 552.301 results in the legal presumption the requested information is public and must be released unless a compelling reason exists to withhold the information from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342, 350 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to section 552.302); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 630 (1994). Generally, a compelling reason to withhold information exists where some other source of law makes the information confidential or where third-party interests are at stake. Open Records Decision No. 150 at 2 (1977). Because the city has failed to comply with the procedural requirements of the Act, it has waived all of its claimed discretionary exceptions to disclosure. *See* Open Records Decision No. 663 at 5 (1999) (untimely request for decision resulted in waiver of discretionary exceptions). Although the city also raises mandatory exceptions to disclosure, because the city has not submitted the requested information for our review, we have no basis for finding any of the information is excepted from disclosure or confidential by law. Thus, we have no choice but to order the city to release the requested information pursuant to section 552.302. If you believe the information is confidential and may not lawfully be released, you must challenge this ruling in court pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code.

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 <http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/>

[orl_ruling_info.shtml](#), or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'B. Berger', written over the typed name.

Brian E. Berger
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

BB/bw

Ref: ID# 595462

c: Requestor