



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 21, 2016

Mr. Ryan D. Pittman  
Counsel for the City of Frisco  
Abernathy Roeder Boyd & Hullett P.C.  
1700 Redbud Boulevard, Suite 300  
McKinney, Texas 75070-1210

OR2016-23654

Dear Mr. Pittman:

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# 631322 (PIR Ref. #G012592-080416).

The City of Frisco (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for building permits and complete histories, including initial and final engineering reports, for five specified piers. You state you have released some information to the requestor. Although you take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, you state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of Crannell, Crannell & Martin Corp. ("Crannell"); Crosstown Land Development Services, Inc. ("Crosstown"); and Independent Foundation Engineers, Inc. ("Independent"). Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified the third parties of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information at issue 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 have received arguments from Independent. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

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) of the Government Code 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 comments from Crannell or Crosstown explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude those parties have protected proprietary interests in the submitted information. *See id.* § 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. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any portion of the submitted information related to Crannell or Crosstown on the basis of any proprietary interest they may have in the information.

Independent asserts its information is protected under section 552.104 of the Government Code. Section 552.104(a) excepts from disclosure "information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder." Gov't Code § 552.104(a). In considering whether a private third party may assert this exception, the supreme court reasoned because section 552.305(a) of the Government Code includes section 552.104 as an example of an exception that involves a third party's property interest, the court concluded a private third party may invoke this exception. *Boeing Co. v. Paxton*, 466 S.W.3d 831 (Tex. 2015). The "test under section 552.104 is whether knowing another bidder's [or competitor's information] would be an advantage, not whether it would be a decisive advantage." *Id.* at 841. Independent states it has competitors, which includes the requestor. In addition, Independent states the information at issue, if released, would give the requestor an advantage in submitting competitive bids. After review of the information at issue and consideration of the arguments, we find Independent has established the release of its information would give advantage to a competitor or bidder. Thus, we conclude the city may withhold Independent's information under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code. As no other exceptions are raised, the city must release the remaining 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.

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 [http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl\\_ruling\\_info.shtml](http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml), or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for

providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ashley Crutchfield". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Ashley Crutchfield  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

AC/bw

Ref: ID# 631322

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

3 Third Parties  
(w/o enclosures)