



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

March 20, 2007

Mr. Scott A. Kelly  
Deputy General Counsel  
Texas A&M System  
200 Technology Way, Suite 2079  
College Station, Texas 77845-3424

OR2007-03074

Dear Mr. Kelly:

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# 273813.

The Texas A&M University (the "university") received a request for the responses submitted by the top two bidders to the university's request for proposals entitled RFP 07-0003 Main. You claim that the submitted information may contain proprietary information subject to exception under the Act, but make no arguments and take no position as to whether the information is so excepted. Pursuant to section 552.305 of the Government Code, you have notified RETNA Media, Inc. ("RETNA") and Graphic Content, Inc. ("Graphic Content") of the request and of their opportunity to submit comments to this office as to why the requested information should not be released to the requestor. *See Gov't Code § 552.305(d); see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain the applicability of exception to disclose under Act in certain circumstances). We have received correspondence on behalf of RETNA. We have considered submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note, and you acknowledge, that the university has not complied with the time periods prescribed by section 552.301(e) of the Government Code in requesting a decision from this office. When a governmental body fails to comply with the procedural requirement of section 552.301, the information at issue is presumed public. *See Gov't Code § 552.302;*

*Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ); *City of Houston v. Houston Chronicle Publ'g Co.*, 673 S.W.2d 316, 323 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, no writ); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). To overcome this presumption, the governmental body must show a compelling reason to withhold the information. See Gov't Code § 552.302; *Hancock*, 797 S.W.2d at 381. Because the third party interest at issue here can provide a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness, we will address the submitted arguments.

An interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of a governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) of the Government Code to submit its reasons, if any, as to why requested information relating to that party should be withheld from disclosure. See Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, Graphic Content has not submitted comments to this office explaining why any portion of the submitted information relating to Graphic Content should not be released to the requestor. Thus, we have no basis to conclude that the release of any portion of the submitted information relating to Graphic Content would implicate the company's proprietary interests. See Gov't Code § 552.110; Open Records Decision Nos. 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 661 at 5-6 (1999) (stating that business enterprise that claims exception for commercial or financial information under section 552.110(b) must show by specific factual evidence that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm). Accordingly, we conclude that the university may not withhold any portion of the submitted information pertaining to Graphic Content on the basis of any proprietary interests that this company may have in the information.

We next address the submitted arguments. RETNA contends that its information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.104 of the Government Code. Section 552.104 excepts from disclosure "information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder." See Gov't Code § 552.104. However, we note that section 552.104 is a discretionary exception that protects only the interests of a governmental body, as distinguished from exceptions which are intended to protect the interests of third parties. See Open Records Decision Nos. 592 (1991) (statutory predecessor to section 552.104 designed to protect interests of a governmental body in a competitive situation, and not interests of private parties submitting information to the government), 522 (1989) (discretionary exceptions in general). As the university does not seek to withhold any information pursuant to section 552.104, we find this section does not apply to the information at issue, and it may not be withheld on that basis. See Open Records Decision No. 592.

RETNA claims that portions of its information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. Section 552.110(b) protects "[c]ommercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that disclosure would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained[.]" Gov't Code § 552.110(b). This exception to disclosure

requires a specific factual or evidentiary showing, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the information at issue. Gov't Code § 552.110(b); *see also Nat'l Parks & Conservation Ass'n v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974); Open Records Decision No. 661 (1999).

Having considered RETNA's arguments and reviewed the submitted information, we find that RETNA has not established by specific factual evidence that any of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure as commercial or financial information the release of which would cause RETNA substantial competitive harm under section 552.110(b). *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661 (1999) (for information to be withheld under commercial or financial information prong of section 552.110(b), business must show by specific factual evidence that substantial competitive injury would result from release of particular information at issue), 509 at 5 (1988) (because costs, bid specifications, and circumstances would change for future contracts, assertion that release of bid proposal might give competitor unfair advantage on future contracts is too speculative), 319 at 3 (1982) (information relating to organization and personnel, market studies, qualifications, and pricing not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Specifically, some of the information RETNA seeks to withhold includes pricing information. We note that the pricing information of a winning bidder is generally not excepted under section 552.110. *See* Open Records Decision No. 514 (1988) (public has interest in knowing prices charged by government contractors). Thus, the university may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.110 of the Government Code.

We note that some of the submitted information is 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. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.* 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 550 (1990). As no other exceptions to disclosure have been raised, the submitted information must be released, but any copyrighted information may only be released in accordance with copyright law.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full

benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days—*Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).


If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Office of the Attorney General at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Amy L.S. Shipp  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

ALS/sdk

Ref: ID# 273813

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Gayle Sheehan  
Senior Vice President  
Bells International, Inc.  
109 Denson Drive  
Austin, Texas 78752-4148  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Fritz Colinet  
Creative Director and CEO  
RETNA Media, Inc.  
3406 Cline Street  
Houston, Texas 77020  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Art Garcia  
Creative Director and President  
Graphic Content, Inc.  
600 North Bishop Avenue, Suite 200  
Dallas, Texas 75208  
(w/o enclosures)