



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

January 30, 2020

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

OR2020-02807

Dear Ms. Burnett:

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# 809055 (UT OGC# 193460).

The University of Texas at Austin (the "university") received a request for four categories of information pertaining to public information requests and two named companies. The university states it will release some information to the requestor. The university informs us it does not have information responsive to a portion of the request.¹ Although the university takes no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, the university states release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of Huron Consulting Services, LLC ("Huron") and Vail Resorts ("Vail"). Accordingly, the university states, and provides documentation showing, it notified each third party 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 Huron. We have reviewed the submitted information and the submitted arguments.

Initially, we note 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

¹ The Act does not require a governmental body to release information that did not exist when a request for information was received or to prepare new information in response to a request. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266, 267-68 (Tex. Civ. App. San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

disclosure. *See id.* § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received comments from Vail explaining why its information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude Vail has a protected proprietary interest in the submitted information, and the university may not withhold any portion of it 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 Huron raises arguments for contracts 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 contracts at issue are between the university, a state agency, and Huron, a private vendor, for the purchase of goods or services. We note the contracts are valued at more than \$15,000 and have not expired nor been completed. Huron raises sections 552.101 and 552.104 of the Government Code for portions of 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). Upon review, we find the contracts at issue are subject to the amendments; therefore, we will consider the submitted arguments under sections 552.101 and 552.104 for the information at issue.

Section 552.104(a) 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. Huron states it has competitors. In addition, Huron states release of the information at issue would provide its competitors with a competitive advantage. We note Huron seeks to withhold some of the terms of a 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 839. After review of the information at issue and consideration of the arguments, we find Huron 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 Huron indicated, which we have marked, under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code.²

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this

² As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address Huron's remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. However, we note an individual's name, address, and telephone number are generally not private information under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision No. 554 at 3 (1990) (disclosure of person's name, address, or telephone number not an invasion of privacy). Upon review, we find Huron has failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information it marked is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the university may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the university may withhold the information Huron indicated, which 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,



Gerald Arismendez
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

GAA/jxd

Ref: ID# 809055

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

2 Third Parties
(w/o enclosures)