



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

GREG ABBOTT

April 9, 2008

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

OR2008-04764

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# 307040.

The West Texas A&M University (the "university") received a request for information pertaining to the daily rate that a named company charges the university for each meal plan. The university takes no position on whether the requested information is excepted from disclosure, but states that release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of Aramark Educational Services, L.L.C. ("Aramark"). Accordingly, you inform us, and provide documentation showing, that you notified Aramark of the request and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why its information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permitted governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under certain circumstances). Aramark asserts that the submitted information is excepted under section 552.110 of the Government Code. We have considered Aramark's argument and reviewed the submitted information.

Aramark asserts that the submitted information, which consists of an executed amendment to a contract that pertains to pricing, is 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).

Having considered Aramark's arguments and reviewed the information at issue, we find that Aramark has not demonstrated that of the information at issue is excepted 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). Although Aramark argues confidentiality for its pricing terms because the requestor in this case is a competitor currently in the process of responding to a Request for Proposal for Food Service Operations issued by the university, we note that the pricing information of a company contracting with a governmental body 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). *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). We also note that 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). Furthermore, we believe the public has a strong interest in the release of prices in government contract awards. Accordingly, the university may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code, and must instead release the submitted information to the requestor.

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.

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,



Jennifer Luttrall  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JL/eeg

Ref: ID# 307040

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Mark Canaday  
Account Executive  
Sodexo  
4301 West Devils Den Lane  
Tishomingo, Oklahoma 73460  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Gregory B. Lare  
Assistant General Counsel  
Aramark  
1101 Market Street  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107  
(w/o enclosures)