



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 11, 2016

Mr. R. Brooks Moore  
Managing Counsel, Governance  
The Texas A&M University System  
301 Tarrow Street, Sixth Floor  
College Station, Texas 77840-7896

OR2016-03377

Dear Mr. Moore:

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# 598015.

Texas A&M University (the "university") received a request for the contract between the university and Chartwells. Although you take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, you state release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of Chartwells. Accordingly, you state you notified Chartwells of the request for information and of its 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 considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted 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 (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 disclosure of some of the submitted information would enable its competitors to more effectively negotiate with schools in the future and undercut Chartwells in subsequent bids. Chartwells also states

release of the information at issue would limit its ability to offer competitive cost structures in the future. 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, 842. After review of the information at issue and consideration of the arguments, we find Chartwells has established the release of the information at issue, which we have marked, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder. Thus, we conclude the university may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> As no exceptions against disclosure have been raised for the remaining information, it must be released.

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,



Meredith L. Coffman  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

MLC/dls

---

<sup>1</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

Ref: ID# 598015

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

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