



Pete Thompson
T (214) 651-2033
F (214) 659-4042
Email: Pete.Thompson@clarkhillstrasburger.com

December 7, 2020

Office of the Attorney General

December 7, 2020

Page 2

same day the College electronically filed its letter through the Attorney General's online portal. *See Exhibit Q*, Email Correspondence Sent to Requestor. Similarly, the College provided Mr. Steinbaugh a copy of its response letter to his comments on the same day it filed that response on November 16, 2020. *See Id.* In accordance with Section 552.301, portions of these written communications were redacted to protect specific discussion of the responsive information.

In Mr. Steinbaugh's letter dated December 2, 2020, when addressing whether the College provided information to him that it shared with the Attorney General, Mr. Steinbaugh misrepresents to your office that, "the College did not do so." Such statement is blatantly false. As explained above, the College timely provided Mr. Steinbaugh with a copy of its original written arguments and response letter in accordance with Section 552.301. The College has been in full compliance with the applicable requirements of Section 552.301.

Perhaps upon realization of such a mistake, in the December 3rd letter, Mr. Steinbaugh clarifies that he did not receive copies of supporting exhibits referenced in the College's communications to your office. Mr. Steinbaugh's statements are again misleading. The Attorney General's office has previously held that a governmental body complies with Section 552.301(d)(2) if it provides a copy of its written arguments to a requestor, **even if does not provide copies of all exhibits to that requestor.** *See* TEX. ATT'Y GEN. OP. OR2004-10228 (2004) (finding that while requestor was not provided copies of certain exhibits, the governmental entity provided the requestor with a copy of its arguments, and thus complied with the procedural requirement of section

