



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 30, 2019

Ms. Jennifer Burnett
Senior Attorney & Public Information Coordinator
The University of Texas System
210 West 7th Street
Austin, Texas 78701

OR2019-19012A

Dear Ms. Burnett:

This office issued Open Records Letter No. 2019-19012 (2019) on July 15, 2019. Since that date, we have received new information that affects the facts on which this ruling was based. Consequently, this decision serves as the corrected ruling and is a substitute for Open Records Letter No. 2019-19012. *See generally* Gov't Code § 552.011 (providing that Office of Attorney General may issue decision to maintain uniformity in application, operation, and interpretation of Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code). This ruling was assigned ID# 789943 (UT OGC# 190250).

The University of Texas at Austin (the "university") received a request for information relating to a specified contract. The university informs us it has released some information to the requestor. Although the university takes no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, the university states release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of Ex Libris (USA) Inc. ("Ex Libris"). Accordingly, the university states, and provides documentation showing, it notified Ex Libris 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 and considered comments from Ex Libris and reviewed the submitted information.

We note the submitted information includes a contract that is subject to section 2261.253 of the Government Code. Section 2261.253 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[.]

...

(b) A state agency monthly may post contracts described by Subsection (a) that are valued less than \$15,000.

...

(e) A state agency that posts a contract on its Internet website as required under this section shall redact from the posted contract

(1) information that is confidential under law; [and]

(2) information the attorney general determines is excepted from public disclosure under [the Act.]

...

(f) The redaction of information under Subsection (e) does not exempt the information from the requirements of Section 552.021 or 552.221.

Gov't Code § 2261.253(a)(1), (b), (e)(1)-(2), (f). The contract at issue is between the university, a state agency, and Ex Libris, a private vendor, for the purchase of goods or services. We note the contract is valued at more than \$15,000 and has not expired nor been completed. Ex Libris raises sections 552.104 and 552.110 of the Government Code for the information at issue; however, 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). The 85th Legislature amended section 2261.253; pursuant to the amendments, state agencies shall redact from contracts subject to section 2261.253 information that is confidential under law or information the attorney general determines is excepted from public disclosure under the Act. Gov't Code § 2261.253(e)(1)-(2); *see also id.* § 2261.253(f). We note the amendments “apply only in relation to a contract for which a state agency first advertises or otherwise solicits bids, proposals, offers, or qualifications on or after [September 1, 2017].” Act of May 29, 2017, 85th Leg., R.S., ch. 556, § 17(c), 2017 Tex. Sess. Law Serv. 1535, 1540. Upon review, we find the contract at issue is subject

to the amendments; therefore, we will consider Ex Libris's arguments under sections 552.104 and 552.110 for the information at issue.

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. Ex Libris states it has competitors. In addition, Ex Libris states the submitted information "contains confidential commercial and financial information of Ex Libris[.]" the release of which "would give an Ex Libris competitor an unfair advantage against Ex Libris . . . and would cause substantial competitive harm[.]" 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.

Ex Libris seeks to withhold the entirety of the contract at issue under section 552.104 of the Government Code. However, subsection 2261.253(e) states, in relevant part, "[a] state agency that posts a contract on its Internet website as required under [section 2261.253] shall redact [information the attorney general determines is excepted from public disclosure] from the posted contract[.]" *See* Gov't Code § 2261.253(e) (emphasis added). Interpreting subsection 2261.253(e) to allow a state agency to withhold the entirety of a contract that the legislature, in the same section, expressly requires the state agency to post on its internet website is absurd and not consistent with the unambiguous language used by the legislature. Pursuant to the plain language of this subsection, a state agency may not withhold the entirety of a contract subject to section 2261.253. *See Hernandez v. Ebrum*, 289 S.W.3d 316, 318 (Tex. 2009) (unambiguous statutory language is interpreted according to its plain language unless such an interpretation would lead to absurd results); Attorney General Opinion GA-0876 (2011); *see also* Sen. Comm. on Finance, Bill Analysis, Tex. S.B. 20, 84th Leg., R.S. (2015) ("The purpose of this bill is to reform state agency contracting by clarifying accountability, increasing transparency, and ensuring a fair

competitive process.”). Accordingly, the submitted information may not be withheld in its entirety under section 552.104.

After review of the information at issue and consideration of the arguments, we find Ex Libris has established the release of the information 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). However, we find Ex Libris has failed to establish the release of the remaining information would give advantage to a competitor or bidder. Thus, we conclude the remaining information may not be withheld under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code.

Ex Libris argues the remaining information is excepted from disclosure under 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.*; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 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).


Upon review, we find Ex Libris has failed to demonstrate the release of any of its remaining information would result in substantial harm to its competitive position. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661, 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). Furthermore, we note the contract at issue was awarded to Ex Libris. This office considers the prices charged in government contract awards to be a matter of strong public interest; thus, the pricing information of a winning bidder is generally not excepted under section 552.110(b). *See* Open Records Decision No. 514 (1988) (public has interest in knowing prices charged by government contractors). *See generally* Dep’t of Justice Guide to the Freedom of Information Act 344-345 (2009) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). 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). Accordingly, the university may not withhold any of Ex Libris’s remaining information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

In summary, the university may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code. The university must release the remaining 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 <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open-government/members-public/what-expect-after-ruling-issued> or call the OAG's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Public Information Act may be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the OAG, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Gerald Arismendez". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a prominent initial "G" and a long, sweeping tail.

Gerald Arismendez
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

GAA/jxd

Ref: ID# 789943

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)