ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

October 21, 2008

Ms. Helen Bright
Office of General Counsel
University of Texas System
201 West Seventh Street
Austin, Texas 78701-2902

OR2008-14345

Dear Ms. Bright:

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# 325791.

The University of Texas at Dallas (the "university") received a request for all proposals submitted in response to a specified RFP, including pricing information. Although the university takes no position on the release of the requested information, you explain that it may contain proprietary information subject to exception under the Act. Accordingly, you have notified Time Warner Cable ("TWC"), MeshLinx Wireless, Inc. ("MWI"), and LevelOne Technology ("LT"), of this request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permitted governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under certain circumstances). A representative from TWC has submitted comments to our office. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

We note that 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 requested information relating to that party should be withheld from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received comments from MWI or LT explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude that these companies have protected proprietary interests in the submitted information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(b) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual or evidentiary material, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that it actually faces competition and that substantial competitive injury would likely result from disclosure); Open Records Decision Nos. 639 at 4 (1996), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3 (1990).

TWC asserts that its information is excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.104 of the Government Code, which excepts from disclosure "information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder." Gov't Code § 552.104. Section 552.104, however, is a discretionary exception that protects only the interests of a governmental body, as distinguished from exceptions that are intended to protect the interests of third parties. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 592 (1991) (statutory predecessor to section 552.104 designed to protect interests of a governmental body in a competitive situation, and not interests of private parties submitting information to the government), 522 (1989) (discretionary exceptions in general). As the university does not seek to withhold any information pursuant to this exception, we find that section 552.104 is not applicable to TWC's proposal. *See* ORD 592 (governmental body may waive section 552.104).

However, we note that the submitted proposals contain insurance policy numbers. Section 552.136(b) states that "[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."[1] Gov't Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining "access device"). This office has determined that insurance policy numbers are access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. We have marked insurance policy numbers in the submitted information that the university must withhold under section 552.136. As no further exceptions to disclosure have been raised, the remaining 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

---

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

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 file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3). If the governmental body does not file suit over 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, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, 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 challenge 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 Office of the Attorney General 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. 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,

Matt Entsminger
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MRE/jb

Ref: ID# 325791

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Wendi Lisso
715 West 23rd Street, Suite M
Austin, Texas 78705
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Karla Martin
Time Warner Cable
1776 North Greenville Avenue
Richardson, Texas 75081
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Chip Thompson
LevelOne Technology
300 South 13th Street
Waco, Texas 75701
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Dale Meitzer
MeshLInx Wireless, Inc.
1500 International Parkway, #200
Richardson, Texas 78081
(w/o enclosures)