



KEN PAXTON  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 23, 2016

Mr. Ronny H. Wall  
Associate General Counsel  
Texas Tech University System  
P.O. Box 42021  
Lubbock, Texas 79409-2021

OR2016-04316

Dear Mr. Wall:

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# 599159.

Angelo State University (the "university") received a request for all requests for proposals, proposals, and contracts to provide food services at the university. Although the university takes no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, it states release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of ARAMARK Educational Services, LLC ("ARAMARK") and Chartwells. Accordingly, the university states, and provides documentation showing, it notified ARAMARK and Chartwells of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in the Act in certain circumstances). We have received comments from Chartwells. We have reviewed the submitted information.

An interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received comments from ARAMARK explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore,

we have no basis to conclude ARAMARK has a protected proprietary interest in the submitted information. *See id.* § 552.110; Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case information is trade secret), 542 at 3. Accordingly, the university may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest ARAMARK may have in the 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). In considering whether a private third party may assert this exception, the supreme court reasoned because section 552.305(a) of the Government Code includes section 552.104 as an example of an exception that involves a third party’s property interest, a private third party may invoke this exception. *Boeing Co. v. Paxton*, 466 S.W.3d 831, 839 (Tex. 2015). 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.” *Id.* at 841. Chartwells states it has competitors. In addition, Chartwells states release of the information at issue will give advantage to its competitors and seeks to withhold some of the terms of the contract. For many years, this office concluded the terms of a contract and especially the pricing of a winning bidder are public and generally not excepted from disclosure. Gov’t Code § 552.022(a)(3) (contract involving receipt or expenditure of public funds expressly made public); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 8 (1990) (public has interest in knowing terms of contract with state agency), 514 (1988) (public has interest in knowing prices charged by government contractors), 494 (1988) (requiring balancing of public interest in disclosure with competitive injury to company). *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). However, now, pursuant to *Boeing*, section 552.104 is not limited to only ongoing competitive situations, and a third party need only show release of its competitively sensitive information would give an advantage to a competitor even after a contract is executed. *Boeing*, 466 S.W.3d at 832. After review of the information at issue and consideration of the arguments, we find Chartwells has established the release of the information at issue would give advantage to a competitor or bidder. Thus, we conclude the university may withhold the information Chartwells has indicated under section 552.104(a).<sup>1</sup> As no other exceptions are raised for the remaining information, the university must release it.

---

<sup>1</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address Chartwells’ remaining arguments against disclosure of this 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](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,



David L. Wheelus  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

DLW/bhf

Ref: ID# 599159

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Brian Pressler  
ARAMARK Educational Services, LLC  
1101 Market Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19107  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. David M. Strauss  
Chartwells  
2 International Drive  
Rye Brook, New York 10573  
(w/o enclosures)