



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

April 7, 2008

Ms. Carol Longoria
Office of General Counsel
University of Texas System
201 West Seventh Street
Austin, Texas 78701-2902

OR2008-04621

Dear Ms. Longoria:

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# 306641.

The University of Texas Health Center at Tyler (the "university") received a request for information pertaining to the winning bidder for remote order entry pharmacy services. Although you take no position with respect to the public availability of the requested information, you state that its release may implicate the proprietary interests of Envision Telepharmacy ("Envision"). Accordingly, you have notified Envision of the request and of its opportunity to submit arguments to this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 allows a governmental body to rely on an interested third party to raise and explain the applicability of an exception to disclosure in certain circumstances). We have considered arguments submitted by Envision, and we have reviewed the submitted information.

Envision asserts that portions of its proposal and resulting contract to provide pharmacy services are subject to 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. *Id.* § 552.110(b); *see also National Parks & Conservation Ass'n v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974); Open Records Decision No. 661 (1999).

In this instance, Envision seeks to withhold the majority of its proposal, including its customer list and pricing information, under section 552.110(b). Having considered Envision's arguments and reviewed the information at issue, we agree that Envision's customer list, which we have marked, is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(b). We find, however, that Envision has not established by specific factual evidence that release of any of the remaining information at issue would cause it substantial competitive harm in order to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. *See* Open Record Decision Nos. 661 (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm), 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 (information relating to organization, personnel, and qualifications not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Additionally, we note that the pricing information of a company contracting with a governmental body is generally not excepted under section 552.110. *See* Open Record Decision No. 514 (public has interest in knowing prices charged by government contractors); *see generally* Freedom of Information Act Guide & Privacy Act Overview, 219 (2000) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). Moreover, the terms of a contract with a governmental body are generally not excepted from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(3) (contract involving receipt or expenditure of public funds expressly made public); Open Records Decision No. 541 at 8 (1990) (public has interest in knowing terms of contract with state agency). Accordingly, the university must only withhold the customer list we have marked under section 552.110 of the Government Code. None of the remaining submitted information may be withheld on that basis, and must instead be released to the requestor.

We note that some of the submitted information appears to be 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).

In summary, the university must withhold the customer list we have marked under section 552.110 of the Government Code. The remaining submitted information must be released, but only in accordance with copyright law.¹

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 file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, 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 challenge 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.

¹We note that the submitted information contains a social security number. Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office under the Act.

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,



Allan D. Meesey
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

ADM/eeg

Ref: ID# 306641

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Eghe J. Igbinovia, Pharm. D
Advanced Pharmacy Staffing and ROE Pharmacy
6295 Harrison Drive, Suite. #3
Las Vegas, Nevada 89120
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Emily Alexander, Pharm. D, PCPS
Envision Telepharmacy
503 East Hancock Avenue
Alpine, Texas 79830
(w/o enclosures)