



April 25, 2002

Ms. Ann-Marie P. Sheely
Assistant County Attorney
Travis County
P.O. Box 1748
Austin, Texas 78767

OR2002-2135

Dear Ms. Sheely:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 161864.

The Travis County Purchasing Office (the "county") received three requests for information relating to request for proposal number P010106-LC. The requestors specifically sought copies of submitted bids, pricing information, and scoring and evaluation information. You state that the county will be releasing scoring and pricing information but assert that third parties Frank Solutions, Inc. - Telepath ("Telepath"), VYSYS, and EPOS may have proprietary interests in some of the other responsive information. Although you take no position regarding the proprietary nature of this information, you have notified these parties of the request for information and their opportunity to submit comments to this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure in certain circumstances).

An interested third party is allowed 10 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* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received arguments from any of the third parties for withholding the requested information. We thus have no basis for concluding that the submitted records contain proprietary information. *See, e.g.*, Gov't Code § 552.110(b); 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); Open Records Decision Nos. 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish prima facie case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3 (1990).

We note, however, that the submitted information contains e-mail addresses that must be withheld under section 552.137 of the Government Code. Section 552.137 provides in relevant part:

(a) An e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body is confidential and not subject to disclosure under this chapter.

(b) Confidential information described by this section that relates to a member of the public may be disclosed if the member of the public affirmatively consents to its release.

Section 552.137 requires the county to withhold e-mail addresses of members of the public that have been provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with the county, unless the members of the public have affirmatively consented to their release. As there is no indication that the members of the public whose e-mail addresses are at issue have consented to their release, the county must withhold from disclosure the e-mail addresses we have marked pursuant to section 552.137 of the Government Code.

In summary, the county must withhold the marked e-mail addresses. All other information must be released.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records;


2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at 877/673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at 512/475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Denis C. McElroy
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

DCM/seg

Ref: ID# 161864

Enc. Marked documents

c: Ms. Ashley E. Boos
Proposal Coordinator
EPOS Corporation
P.O. Box 3140
Auburn, Alabama 36831-3140
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Fred R. Stone
Director - Government Systems
Centurion, Inc.
2825 South Moorland Road
New Berlin, Wisconsin 53151
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Keith Blackmon
EPOS Corporation
P.O. Box 3140
Auburn, Alabama 36831-3140
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Michael E. Bunton
Senior Sales Consultant
VYSYS
455 2nd Avenue South
Nashville, Tennessee 37201
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Greg Trainor
Vice-President - Operations
Frank Solutions, Inc. - Telepath
9250 East Costilla, Suite 100
Greenwood Village, Colorado 80112-3644
(w/o enclosures)