



OFFICE *of the* ATTORNEY GENERAL  
GREG ABBOTT

January 24, 2003

Ms. Dona G. Hamilton  
University of Houston System  
311 East Cullen Building  
Houston, Texas 77204-2028

OR2003-1172

Dear Ms. Hamilton:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 179031.

The University of Houston (the "university") received a request for any specific criteria scoring, comments, or any other feedback regarding the requestor's proposal in response to a Request for Proposals, and copies of the winning proposals. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.104 and 552.110 of the Government Code. You state, and provide documentation showing, that you have notified three vendors, third parties whose proprietary interests have been implicated by the request, of the request for information. *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 in Public Information Act in certain circumstances). We have considered all submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.104 states that information is excepted from required public disclosure if release of the information would give advantage to a competitor or bidder. The purpose of section 552.104 is to protect a governmental body's interests in competitive bidding situations. *See* Open Records Decision No. 592 (1991). Moreover, section 552.104 requires a showing of some actual or specific harm in a particular competitive situation; a general allegation that a competitor will gain an unfair advantage will not suffice. Open Records Decision No. 541 at 4 (1990). This office has long held that section 552.104 does not except information relating to competitive bidding situations once a contract is in effect. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 541 (1990), 514 (1988), 306 (1982), 184 (1978), 75 (1975).

In this case, you inform us that the university is “currently in negotiations with three firms who submitted bids in response to the Request for Proposals, to finalize the conditions under which these firms will perform technical services for the University.” You explain that disclosing the contents of the bids at this time would jeopardize contract negotiations, resulting in harm to the university by delaying commencement of the services for which the university and the firms are negotiating to contract. You further explain that release of the bid information at this time would allow for the firms to gain advantages over each other and would interfere with the university’s negotiations. Finally, you state that releasing the information could cause the vendors to alter their positions, potentially causing the contract negotiations to fail, ultimately leading to financial harm to the university. Based on these arguments and our review of the submitted information, we conclude that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure based on section 552.104 until such time as the contract negotiations are complete and the contracts have been awarded and are in effect. As we are able to make this determination, we need not address your remaining claimed exception.

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 Dep't of Pub. 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,



Sarah I. Swanson  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

SIS/lmt

Ref: ID# 179031

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Mr. Mike Bennett  
ConServe  
P. O. Box 7  
Fairport, NY 14450

Ms. Megan L. Sheehan  
General Counsel  
Windham Professionals  
380 Main Street  
Salem, NH 03079  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Gary L. Williams  
President/CEO  
Williams Fudge  
P. O. Box 11590  
Rock Hill, SC 29731  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Kevin T. Dreyer  
Corporate Counsel  
General Revenue Corporation  
11501 Northlake Drive  
Cincinnati, OH 45249-1643  
w/o enclosures)