



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 1, 2017

Ms. Ana Vieira Ayala  
Assistant General Counsel & Public Information Coordinator  
The University of Texas System  
201 West 7<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 600  
Austin, Texas 78701-2901

OR2017-04054

Dear Ms. Ayala:

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# 646843 (OGC# 172939).

The University of Texas Medical Branch at Galveston (the "university") received a request for fifteen categories of information pertaining to a specified request for proposals. You claim the university does not have any information responsive to a portion of the request.<sup>1</sup> Additionally, you claim some of the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.111 of the Government Code. You also state release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of Triage Consulting Group ("Triage"); Meridian Billing Management Corp. ("Meridian"); Source HOV ("Source"); and Rubixis, Inc. ("Rubixis"). Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified Triage, Meridian, Source, and Rubixis 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

---

<sup>1</sup>The Act does not require a governmental body that receives a request for information to create information that did not exist when the request was received. See *Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 563 at 8 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

received comments from Triage. We have considered the submitted arguments and 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 to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this ruling, we have not received comments from Meridian, Source, or Rubixis explaining why their information should not be released to the requestor. Thus, we have no basis to conclude the release of the information at issue would implicate the interests of these third parties, and none of the information at issue may be withheld on that basis. *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, that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3.

We note Triage argues against the release of information that was not submitted by the university. This ruling does not address information that was not submitted by the university and is limited to the information the university has submitted for our review. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body requesting decision from attorney general must submit copy of specific information requested).

Next, we note the submitted information includes a contract for the purchase of services from a private vendor that is subject to the posting requirements in section 2261.253 of the Government Code. Section 2261.253(a) provides, in relevant part, as follows:

(a) For each contract for the purchase of goods or services from a private vendor, each state agency shall post on its Internet website:

(1) each contract the agency enters into, including contracts entered into without inviting, advertising for, or otherwise requiring competitive bidding before selection of the contractor, until the contract expires or is completed[.]

*Id.* § 2261.253(a)(1). The submitted contract, valued at more than \$15,000 is between the university, which is a state agency, and a private vendor for the purchase of services, and the contract is not expired or completed. *See id.* §§ 2261.002(2) ("state agency" has meaning assigned by Gov't Code § 2151.002), 2151.002(3) ("state agency" includes university system or institution of higher education as defined by Educ. Code § 61.003). Accordingly, the submitted contract is required to be posted on the university's internet website. Although Triage seeks to withhold portions of the contract at issue under sections 552.104 and 552.110 of the Government Code, the exceptions to disclosure found in the Act do not generally apply to information that other statutes make public. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 623 at 3

(1994), 525 at 3 (1989). Therefore, the university may not withhold any portion of the submitted contract under section 552.104 or section 552.110 of the Government Code. Accordingly, the university must release the contract in its entirety.

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). 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. Triage states it has competitors. Triage argues release of its information at issue would provide its competitors with an advantage. We note Triage was the winning bidder for the information at issue, and Triage seeks to withhold its pricing information in the remaining information at issue. 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 only to 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 Triage has established the release of its information at issue would give advantage to a competitor or bidder. Thus, we conclude the university may withhold Triage’s pricing information in the remaining information, which we have marked, under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup>

Section 552.111 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[a]n interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.111. This exception encompasses the deliberative process privilege. *See* Open Records Decision No. 615 at 2 (1993). The purpose of section 552.111 is to protect advice, opinion, and recommendation in the decisional process and to encourage open and frank discussion in the deliberative process. *See Austin v. City of San Antonio*, 630 S.W.2d 391, 394 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1982, writ ref’d n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 538 at 1-2 (1990).

---

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

In Open Records Decision No. 615, this office re-examined the statutory predecessor to section 552.111 in light of the decision in *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ). We determined section 552.111 excepts from disclosure only those internal communications that consist of advice, recommendations, opinions, and other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the governmental body. See ORD 615 at 5. A governmental body's policymaking functions do not encompass routine internal administrative or personnel matters, and disclosure of information about such matters will not inhibit free discussion of policy issues among agency personnel. *Id.*; see also *City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351 (Tex. 2000) (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking). A governmental body's policymaking functions do include administrative and personnel matters of broad scope that affect the governmental body's policy mission. See Open Records Decision No. 631 at 3 (1995).

Further, section 552.111 does not protect facts and written observations of facts and events severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.); see ORD 615 at 5. But if factual information is so inextricably intertwined with material involving advice, opinion, or recommendation as to make severance of the factual data impractical, the factual information also may be withheld under section 552.111. See Open Records Decision No. 313 at 3 (1982).

You seek to withhold the some of the remaining information under section 552.111 of the Government Code. You state the information at issue constitutes communications between employees of the university reflecting their deliberative and policy making processes in ranking the responsive bid proposals. You further explain the information at issue consists of request for proposal evaluation summaries which contain and outline advice and recommendations from university employees. Upon review, we find the university may withhold the information you marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

We note some of the remaining information may 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. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; see Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). 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.

In summary, the university must release the submitted contract pursuant to section 2261.253 of the Government Code. The university may withhold Triage's pricing information we have marked in the remaining information under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code. The university may withhold the information you marked under section 552.111 of the

Government Code. The university must release the remaining information; however, any information protected by copyright may only be released in accordance with copyright law.

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,



Sidney M. Pounds  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

SMP/sdk

Ref: ID# 646843

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

4 Third Parties  
(w/o enclosures)