



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 14, 2020

Ms. Jennifer Burnett
Senior Attorney and Public Information Coordinator
Office of General Counsel
The University of Texas System
210 West 7th Street
Austin, Texas 78701-2903

OR2020-25810

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# 848673 (Ref. No. 198212).

The University of Texas at Arlington (the "university") received a request for information pertaining to a specified request for proposals. You claim some of the submitted 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 Anthology, Inc., f/k/a Campus Management ("Anthology"); Calsoft Labs, Inc.; DXC Technologies; Freshworks, Inc. ("Freshworks"); Huron; Oracle America; Sensabyte Technologies; and Technolutions, Inc. ("Technolutions"). Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified these interested third parties 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 received comments from Anthology, Freshworks, and Technolutions. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note Freshworks objects to disclosure of information the university has not submitted to this office for review. 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).

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 id.* § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this ruling, we have only received comments from Anthology, Freshworks, and Technolutions. Thus, we have no basis to conclude any of the remaining interested third parties has a protected proprietary interest in the submitted information. *See, e.g., id.* § 552.110 (requiring the provision of specific factual evidence demonstrating the applicability of the exception). Accordingly, the university may not withhold any of the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest any of the remaining interested third parties may have in the information.

Technolutions raises section 552.104 of the Government Code for its information. Section 552.104 excepts from disclosure information "if a governmental body demonstrates that release of the information would harm its interests by providing an advantage to a competitor or bidder in a particular ongoing competitive situation or in a particular competitive situation where the governmental body establishes the situation at issue is set to reoccur or there is a specific and demonstrable intent to enter into the competitive situation again in the future." Gov't Code § 552.104(a) (emphasis added). In *Boeing Co. v. Paxton*, 466 S.W.3d 831 (Tex. 2015), the Texas Supreme Court held section 552.104 does not preclude third parties from raising section 552.104 as an exception to disclosure. *See Boeing*, 466 S.W.3d at 842. However, the Eighty-sixth Legislature has amended section 552.104 since the issuance of *Boeing*. *See* Act of May 25, 2019, 86th Leg., R.S., S.B. 943, § 3. Section 552.104 now expressly limits the protections of section 552.104 to governmental bodies. Gov't Code § 552.104(a). Therefore, we do not address Technolutions' arguments under section 552.104.

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 section 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).

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 information 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 2002, no pet.); *see* ORD 615 at 5. But if factual information is so inextricably intertwined with material involving advice, opinion, or recommendations 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 state the information you have indicated consists of communications between university employees pertaining to the evaluation and scoring of the bid proposals at issue. You explain this information is reflective of the deliberative and policymaking processes by which the university ranks the bid proposals at issue. Thus, you state the information at issue consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations of the university pertaining to its policymaking functions. Based upon these representations and our review of the information at issue, we find you have demonstrated the information at issue consists of advice, opinions, or recommendations on the policymaking matters of the university. Thus, the university may withhold the information you have indicated under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Section 552.110(c) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “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[.]” Gov't Code § 552.110(c). Anthology, Freshworks, and Technolutions argue some of their information consists of commercial or financial information subject to section 552.110(c). Upon review, we find Anthology, Freshworks, and Technolutions each demonstrated portions of the information at issue constitute commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause substantial competitive harm. Accordingly, the university must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(c) of the Government Code.¹ However, we find Anthology, Freshworks, and Technolutions have failed to provide specific factual evidence demonstrating 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 remaining information at issue under section 552.110(c) of the Government Code.

Section 552.110(b) of the Government Code states “information is [excepted from required disclosure] if it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that the information is a trade secret.” *See id.* § 552.110(b). Section 552.110(a) defines a trade secret as all forms and types of information if:

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

(1) the owner of the trade secret has taken reasonable measures under the circumstances to keep the information secret; and

(2) the information derives independent economic value, actual or potential, from not being generally known to, and not being readily ascertainable through proper means by, another person who can obtain economic value from the disclosure or use of the information.

Id. § 552.110(a). Anthology, Freshworks, and Technolutions argue some of their remaining information consists of trade secrets subject to section 552.110(b). Upon review, we find Anthology has demonstrated portions of the information at issue constitute trade secrets. Accordingly, to the extent any of the customer information Anthology seeks to withhold has not been published on the company's website, the university must withhold the information we marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, we find Anthology, Freshwork, and Technolutions have failed to provide specific factual evidence demonstrating any portion of the remaining information at issue is a trade secret. Therefore, the university may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

Section 552.139 of the Government Code provides, in part:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information that relates to computer network security, to restricted information under Section 2059.055 [of the Government Code], or to the design, operation, or defense of a computer network.

(b) The following information is confidential:

(1) a computer network vulnerability report; [and]

(2) any other assessment of the extent to which data processing operations, a computer, a computer program, network, system, or system interface, or software of a governmental body or of a contractor of a governmental body is vulnerable to unauthorized access or harm, including an assessment of the extent to which the governmental body's or contractor's electronically stored information containing sensitive or critical information is vulnerable to alteration, damage, erasure, or inappropriate use[.]

Id. § 552.139(a), (b)(1)-(2). Section 2059.055 of the Government Code provides, in part:

(b) Network security information is confidential under this section if the information is:

(1) related to passwords, personal identification numbers, access codes, encryption, or other components of the security system of a state agency;

(2) collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental entity to prevent, detect, or investigate criminal activity; or

(3) related to an assessment, made by or for a governmental entity or maintained by a governmental entity, of the vulnerability of a network to criminal activity.

Id. § 2059.055(b). Freshworks asserts some of its remaining information is confidential under section 552.139 of the Government Code. However, upon review, we find Freshworks has failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.139 to the information at issue. Therefore, the university may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.139 of the Government Code.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code states “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential.”² *Id.* § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). This office has determined an insurance policy number is an access device for purposes of this exception. Thus, the university must withhold the insurance policy numbers in the remaining information under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

We note some of the remaining information may be subject to copyright law. 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 may withhold the information you have indicated under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The university must withhold the information we marked under section 552.110(c) of the Government Code. To the extent any of the customer information Anthology seeks to withhold has not been published on the company’s website, the university must withhold the information we marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. The university must withhold the insurance policy numbers in the remaining information under section 552.136 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.

² The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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,

Meredith L. Coffman
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MLC/jm

Ref: ID# 848673

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

8 Third Parties
(w/o enclosures)