



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 5, 2017

Mr. Benjamin V. Lugg
Attorney
San Antonio Housing Authority
818 South Flores Street
San Antonio, Texas 78204

OR2017-12182

Dear Mr. Lugg:

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# 660480.

The San Antonio Housing Authority (the "authority") received a request for the top three bids for specified requests for proposals. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.104 and 552.110 of the Government Code. Additionally, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified Davidson Troila Ream & Garza, PC; Langley & Banack; McKamie Krueger LLP; Nortorn Rose Fulbright US LLP; Reno & Cavanaugh, PLLC ("Reno"); and Strasburger & Price LLP ("Strasburger") 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 Reno and Strasburger. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, 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 any of the remaining third parties 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 authority may not withhold any portion of the submitted information related to the remaining third parties on the basis of any proprietary interest they may have in the information.

Next, we note Reno seeks to withhold information not submitted to this office by the authority. By statute, this office may only rule on the public availability of information submitted by the governmental body requesting the ruling. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body requesting decision from Attorney General must submit copy of specific information requested). Because this information was not submitted by the authority, this ruling does not address this information and is limited to the information submitted as responsive by the authority.

You argue portions of the submitted proposal are excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. We note, however, section 552.110 is designed to protect the interests of third parties not the interests of a governmental body. *See id.* § 552.110 (excepting from disclosure “[a] trade secret obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision” and “[c]ommercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that disclosure would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained”). Thus, we will not consider the authority’s argument under section 552.110 of the Government Code.

Section 552.104(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder.” *Id.* § 552.104(a). 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.” *Boeing Co. v. Paxton*, 466 S.W.3d 831, 841 (Tex. 2015). Although the authority argues release of the submitted information could harm the notified third parties by giving an advantage to their competitors, such an interest in protecting the information belongs to the third parties and not the authority. Thus, the authority may not withhold the submitted information under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code.

Reno and Strasburger assert portions of their information are protected under section 552.104 of the Government Code. As noted above, 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, 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. Reno and Strasburger state they have competitors. In addition, Reno and Strasburger state the information at issue, if released, would give competitors an advantage in the market. For many years, this office concluded the terms of a contract and especially the pricing of a winning bidder are public and generally not excepted from disclosure. Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(3) (contract involving receipt or expenditure of public funds expressly made public); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 8 (1990) (public has interest in knowing terms of contract with state agency), 514 (1988) (public has interest in knowing prices charged by government contractors), 494 (1988) (requiring balancing of public interest in disclosure with competitive injury to company); *see generally* Freedom of Information Act Guide & Privacy Act Overview, 219 (2000) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). However, now, pursuant to *Boeing*, section 552.104 is not limited to only ongoing competitive situations, and a third party need only show release of its competitively sensitive information would give an advantage to a competitor even after a contract is executed. *Boeing*, 466 S.W.3d at 839. After review of the information at issue and consideration of the arguments, we find Reno and Strasburger have established the release of the information at issue would give advantage to a competitor or bidder. Thus, we conclude the authority may withhold the information we marked under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code.

We note some of the remaining information may be 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. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; *see* Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). 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.

In summary, the authority may withhold the information we marked under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code. The authority must release the remaining information; however, any information subject to copyright may only be released in accordance with copyright law.

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, 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,



Ashley Crutchfield
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

AC/bw

Ref: ID# 660480

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

6 Third Parties
(w/o enclosures)