



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 3, 2017

Ms. Sarah Langlois  
Counsel for the Harris County Department of Education  
Rogers Morris & Grover  
5718 Westheimer Road, Suite 1200  
Houston, Texas 77057

OR2017-22535

Dear Ms. Langlois:

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# 678057.

The Harris County Department of Education (the "department"), which you represent, received two requests from different requestors for winning bids and contracts related to a specified request for proposals.<sup>1</sup> We understand you will withhold access device numbers pursuant to section 552.136(c) of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> 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 third parties. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified ExecuTeam Staffing, LP ("ExecuTeam");

---

<sup>1</sup>We note the department sought and received clarification of the first request for information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also* *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or overbroad request for information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

<sup>2</sup>Section 552.136(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 552.136(b) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See* Gov't Code § 552.136(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.136(e). *See id.* § 552.136(d), (e).

KeyStaff Incorporated; National ProSource; Objectwin Technology, Inc.; Prime Systems; Staffmark Holdings, Inc.; and Superior Talent Resources, Inc. (“Superior”) of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information 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 comments from ExecuTeam and Superior. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note ExecuTeam only argues against disclosure of information not submitted to this office for review. Furthermore, Superior argues in part against disclosure of information not submitted to this office for review. This ruling does not address information beyond what the department has submitted to us for our review. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body requesting decision from attorney general must submit a copy of specific information requested). Accordingly, this ruling is limited to the information the department submitted as responsive to the request for information.<sup>3</sup>

Next, 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) 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 their information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude any of the remaining third parties has a protected proprietary interest 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 department may not withhold any of the information at issue on the basis of any proprietary interest the remaining third parties may have in it.

Section 552.104(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder.” Gov’t Code § 552.104(a). A private third party may invoke this exception. *Boeing Co. v. Paxton*, 466 S.W.3d 831, 839 (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. Superior states it has competitors. In addition, Superior states release of some of the submitted information would give advantage to a competitor or bidder. For many years, this office concluded the terms of a contract and especially the pricing of a

---

<sup>3</sup>As we are able to make this determination, we need not address the arguments against disclosure of this information.

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 831 at 831, 839. After review of the information at issue and consideration of the arguments, we find Superior has established the release of the information at issue would give advantage to a competitor or bidder. Thus, we conclude the department may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code.<sup>4</sup>

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.”<sup>5</sup> Gov't Code § 552.101. This section encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. This office has found personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992) (public employee's withholding allowance certificate, designation of beneficiary of employee's retirement benefits, direct deposit authorization, and employee's decisions regarding voluntary benefits programs, among others, protected under common-law privacy), 545 (1990) (deferred compensation information, participation in voluntary investment program, election of optional insurance coverage, mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history). Upon review, we find some of the remaining information meets the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial*

---

<sup>4</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we do not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

<sup>5</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

*Foundation.* Accordingly, the department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the department may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code and must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The department 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,



Tim Neal  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

TN/tdw

Ref: ID# 678057

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 2 Requestors  
(w/o enclosures)

7 Third Parties  
(w/o enclosures)