



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

January 3, 2022

Mr. R. Brooks Moore
Deputy General Counsel
The Texas A&M University System
301 Tarrow Street, 6th Floor
College Station, Texas 77840-7896

OR2022-00107

Dear Mr. Moore:

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# 924139 (PIR No. F002352-100521).

Texas A&M University (the "university") received a request for certain information pertaining to a specified request for proposals.¹ Although you take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under the Act, you state release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of Aptara, Inc.; DOC2E-File, Inc.; Global Solutions Group; Iron Mountain Information Management; Layton Document Systems, Inc.; MicroMEDIA Imaging Systems; Neubus, Inc. ("Neubus"); OSG Group Holdings, Inc. ("OSG"); Prescient Information Systems; and Stars Information Solutions. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified these third parties of the request for information and of the 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

¹ You state the university sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also* *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.2d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (if governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification of unclear or over-broad request, ten-day period to request attorney general ruling is measured from date request is clarified).

have received comments from Neubus and OSG. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note OSG argues against disclosure of information not submitted to this office for review. This ruling does not address information beyond what the university has submitted to us for our review. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body requesting decision from attorney general must submit a copy of specific information requested). Accordingly, this ruling is limited to the information the university submitted as responsive to the request for information.²

Next, 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 disclosure. *See id.* § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received comments from any remaining interested third party explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude any remaining interested third party 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 the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest any remaining interested third party may have in the information.

Neubus 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." *Id.* § 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 841. 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 Neubus' arguments under section 552.104. As no further exceptions to disclosure have been raised, the university must release the submitted 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.

² As we are able to make this determination, we need not address OSG's argument against disclosure of the information at issue.

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,

Kimbell Kesling
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KK/be

Ref: ID# 924139

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

10 Third Parties
(w/o enclosures)