



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 17, 2020

Ms. Cecilia Alvarez  
Assistant General Counsel  
University of Houston System  
311 East Cullen Building  
Houston, Texas 77204-2028

OR2020-17828

Dear Ms. Alvarez:

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# 834555 (IR06468).

The University of Houston (the "university") received a request for certain information pertaining to a specified request for proposals.<sup>1</sup> The university states it does not have some of the requested information.<sup>2</sup> Although the university takes no position regarding whether the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under the Act, the university informs us its release may implicate the proprietary interests of Coca-Cola Southwest Beverages ("Coca-Cola"). Accordingly, the university states, and provides documentation showing, it notified Coca-Cola of the request for information and of its right to submit arguments to this office. *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

---

<sup>1</sup> We note the university sought or received clarification or narrowing of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (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 overbroad request for information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

<sup>2</sup> The Act does not require a governmental body to create or release information that did not exist when a request for information was received. *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), 563 at 8 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in the Act in certain circumstances). We have received comments from Coca-Cola. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note Coca-Cola seeks to withhold information the university did not submit for our review. Because such information was not submitted by the governmental body, this ruling does not address that information and is limited to the information submitted as responsive by the university. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body requesting decision from Attorney General must submit copy of specific information requested).

Section 552.110(c) of the Government Code states:

(c) Except as provided by Section 552.0222, commercial 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 is [excepted from required disclosure].

*Id.* § 552.110(c). Additionally, we note section 552.0222(b) lists certain types of information to which section 552.110 does not apply. *See id.* § 552.0222(b). Coca-Cola argues its information consists of commercial or financial information subject to section 552.110(c). Upon review, however, we find some of the information at issue is subject to section 552.0222(b) and may not be withheld on the basis of section 552.110(c). Additionally, we find Coca-Cola has failed to provide specific factual evidence demonstrating any of the remaining information at issue constitutes commercial or financial information, the release of which would result in substantial competitive harm. Therefore, the university may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.110(c) of the Government Code.

Section 552.1101 of the Government Code provides, in relevant part:

(a) Except as provided by Section 552.0222, information submitted to a governmental body by a vendor, contractor, potential vendor, or potential contractor in response to a request for a bid, proposal, or qualification is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if the vendor, contractor, potential vendor, or potential contractor that the information relates to demonstrates based on specific factual evidence that disclosure of the information would:

(1) reveal an individual approach to:

(A) work;

(B) organizational structure;

(C) staffing;

(D) internal operations;

(E) processes; or

(F) discounts, pricing methodology, pricing per kilowatt hour, cost data, or other pricing information that will be used in future solicitation or bid documents; and

(2) give advantage to a competitor.

(b) The exception to disclosure provided by Subsection (a) does not apply to:

(1) information in a voucher or contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of public funds by a governmental body; or

(2) communications and other information sent between a governmental body and a vendor or contractor related to the performance of a final contract with the governmental body or work performed on behalf of the governmental body.

*Id.* § 552.1101(a), (b). Additionally, we note section 552.0222(b) lists certain types of information to which section 552.1101(a) does not apply. *See id.* § 552.0222(b). Coca-Cola asserts disclosure of its information would reveal an individual approach to discount, pricing methodology, and other pricing information and give advantage to a competitor. Upon review, however, we find some of the information at issue is subject to section 552.0222(b) and may not be withheld on the basis of section 552.1101(a). *See id.* (listing certain types of information not excepted under section 552.1101). Additionally, we find Coca-Cola has failed to provide the specific factual evidence necessary to withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.1101(a), and the university may not withhold it on that basis.

We note some of the submitted 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. Accordingly, the university must release the submitted information; however, any information subject to 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 <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,

James M. Graham  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JMG/jxd

Ref: ID# 834555

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Third Party  
(w/o enclosures)