



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 13, 2016

Ms. Cynthia Tynan  
Attorney & Public Information Coordinator  
Office of General Counsel  
The University of Texas System  
201 West Seventh Street, Suite 600  
Austin, Texas 78701

OR2016-17747A

Dear Ms. Tynan:

Our office issued Open Records Letter No. 2016-17747 (2016) on August 8, 2016. We have determined the prior ruling should be corrected. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.306, .352. Accordingly, we hereby withdraw the prior ruling. This decision is substituted for Open Records Letter No. 2016-17747 and serves as the correct ruling. *See generally id.* § 552.011 (providing Office of the Attorney General may issue a decision to maintain uniformity in application, operation, and interpretation of Act).

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# 632475 (OGC# 169727).

The University of Texas at Arlington (the "university") received a request for a specified proposal for request for proposals number 2012-007.<sup>1</sup> Although you take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, you state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of University Accounting Services, LLC

---

<sup>1</sup>We note the university sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or over-broad request for public information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

("UAS"). Accordingly, you state you notified UAS of the request for information and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information at issue should not be released. *See id.* § 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 on behalf of UAS. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.104(a) of the Government Code exempts 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 (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. UAS states it has competitors. In addition, UAS states release of the information at issue would give its competitors a competitive advantage and bring substantial harm to UAS. 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 831, 839. After review of the information at issue and consideration of the arguments, we find UAS 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 submitted information under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup>

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.

---

<sup>2</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address UAS's remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

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,



Paige Thompson  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

PT/eb

Ref: ID# 632475

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

1 Third Party  
(w/o enclosures)

