KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 14, 2016

Ms. Cynthia Tynan
Attorney & Public Information Coordinator
Office of General Counsel
The University of Texas System
201 West 7th Street, Suite 600
Austin, Texas 78701-2901

OR2016-15939

Dear Ms. Tynan:

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# 618477 (OGC No. 169242).

The University of Texas System (the "system") received a request for eight categories of correspondence between named individuals, officials from the United States Department of Defense, and employees of a specified third party.[1] You state you do not have information responsive to portions of the requested information.[2] You state you will release some information to the requestor. You claim portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.104, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

---

[1]We note the system sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing 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) (holding when governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification of unclear or overbroad request for public information, ten-business-day period to request attorney general opinion is measured from date request is clarified or narrowed).

[2]The Act does not require a governmental body that receives a request for information to create information that did not exist when the request was received. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dism'd); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 563 at 8 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

Initially, you state the system sought clarification with respect to six categories of the request for information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing 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). You indicate the system has not received a response from the requestor for these portions of the request. Thus, for the portions of the requested information for which you have sought but have not received clarification, we find the system is not required to release information in response to these portions of the request. However, if the requestor clarifies these portions of the request for information, the system must seek a ruling from this office before withholding any responsive information from the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222; *City of Dallas*, 304 S.W.3d at 387. We note a governmental body has a duty to make a good-faith effort to relate a request for information to information the governmental body holds. Open Records Decision No. 561 (1990). In this case, as you have submitted information responsive to the request and have made arguments against disclosure of this information, we will address the applicability of your arguments to the submitted information.

Section 552.104(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder." 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 (Tex. 2015). The system states it has specific marketplace interests in the information it marked because the system is competing with other universities and institutions of higher education for a federally-funded doctoral program to be developed and implemented at one of its institutions. In addition, the system indicates release of the information at issue would cause harm. The system states the information at issue, if released, would be a substantial hindrance for the system because it would no longer be "on equal footing with private entities." After review of the information at issue and consideration of the arguments, we find the system has established the release of the information at issue would give advantage to a competitor or bidder. Thus, we conclude the system may withhold the information you marked under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code.[3]

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).

---

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

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.

You state the information you marked constitutes a draft document prepared by the system which contains advice, opinions, and recommendations regarding policy matters. You state the submitted draft document is intended for release or has been released to the public in its final form. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have established the deliberative process privilege is applicable to the submitted draft document. Accordingly, the system may withhold the information you marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

In summary, the system may withhold the information you marked under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code. The system may withhold the information you marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. 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 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,

Kenny Moreland
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KJM/som

Ref: ID# 618477

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)