



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

December 17, 2004

Ms. Carol Longoria
The University of Texas System
Office of General Counsel
201 West Seventh Street
Austin, Texas 78701-2902

OR2004-10706

Dear Ms. Longoria:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 215117.

The University of Texas at Austin (the "university") received a request for "copies of the top five (5) proposals considered for requisition number: RFPSOFTWAREPROGRAM." You state that the university has released a portion of the requested information to the requestor.¹ Although the university takes no position with respect to the remaining requested information, you claim that portions of the remaining requested information may contain proprietary information subject to exception under the Public Information Act (the "Act"). Pursuant to section 552.305(d) of the Government Code, you have notified third parties BIF Technologies Corporation ("BIF"), Ipso Facto Consulting, Inc. ("IFC"), Raven Rock Development Group, Inc. ("Raven"), and Project Balance of the request and of 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 section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure in certain circumstances). We have reviewed the submitted information.

¹ You note that System Edge, LLC has notified the university that it does not object to the release of its information.

Initially, you acknowledge that the university has not sought an open records decision from this office within ten business days as required by section 552.301(b) of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(b). Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless the governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.302; *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to section 552.302); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). Generally speaking, a compelling reason for non-disclosure exists where some other source of law makes the information confidential or where third party interests are at stake. Open Records Decision No. 150 at 2 (1977). Because third party interests can provide a compelling reason to withhold information, we will consider whether any of the requested information must be withheld to protect third party interests.

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* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, neither BIF, IFC, Raven, nor Project Balance has submitted to this office any reasons explaining why information relating to any of them should not be released. We thus have no basis for concluding that any portion of the submitted information constitutes proprietary information protected under section 552.110, and none of it may be withheld on that basis. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110; 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), 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 social security numbers, which may be confidential under federal law.² Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision" and encompasses information that another statute makes confidential. Gov't Code § 552.101. A social security number is confidential under section 552.101 in conjunction with 1990 amendments to the federal Social Security Act if it was obtained or is maintained by a governmental entity under any provision of law enacted on or after October 1, 1990. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I); Open Records Decision No. 622 at 2-4 (1994). It is not apparent to this office that the social security numbers contained

² The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions like sections 552.101 and 552.137 on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

in the submitted documents are confidential under section 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I) of the federal law. You have cited no law, and we are aware of no law, enacted on or after October 1, 1990 that requires or authorizes the university to obtain or maintain social security numbers. Thus, we have no basis for concluding that the social security numbers in question here were obtained or are maintained under such a law and are therefore confidential under the federal law. We caution you, however, that the Act imposes criminal penalties for the release of confidential information. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.007, .352. Therefore, before releasing the social security numbers that we have marked, the university should ensure that they were not obtained and are not maintained by the university under any provision of law enacted on or after October 1, 1990.

Finally, we note that some of the submitted information is 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. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.* 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 550 (1990).

In summary, the social security numbers in the submitted documents may be confidential under federal law. The remaining submitted information must be released in accordance with applicable copyright laws.

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,



Lauren E. Kleine
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LEK/jev

Ref: ID# 215117

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Randy Miller
EuroSoft, Inc.
1705 South Capital of Texas Highway, #200
Austin, Texas 78746
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Bob Holzman
BIF Technologies, Corp.
814 Arion Parkway, Suite 100
San Antonio, Texas 78216
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Inder P. Singh
Ipsos Facto Consulting, Inc.
7719 Wood Hollow Drive, Suite 265
Austin, Texas 78731
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Steve Szyszko
Raven Rock Development Group, Inc.
1727 Mearns Meadow
Austin, Texas 78758
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Stacy Berlow
Project Balance
7500 Valburn Drive
Austin, Texas 78731
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Som Bhattacharya
System Edge, LLC
555 US Route 1 South
Woodbridge Tower, 4th Floor
Iselin, New Jersey 08830
(w/o enclosures)