



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 13, 2019

Mr. Ryan D. Pittman  
Counsel for the City of Frisco  
Abernathy Roeder Boyd & Hullett, P.C.  
1700 Redbud Boulevard, Suite 300  
McKinney, Texas 75069

OR2019-16008

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# 770280 (ORR# G031808).

The City of Frisco (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for architectural drawings of a specified location. Although the city takes no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, the city states release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of Burk & Wirz Design Partnership ("B&W").<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, the city states, and provides documentation showing, it notified B&W of the request for information and of the 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 reviewed the submitted information.

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*

---

<sup>1</sup>The city did not comply with section 552.301 of the Government Code in requesting a ruling from this office. *See Gov't Code* § 552.301(b), (e). Nonetheless, because third-party interests can provide a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness, we will consider the submitted argument against release of the submitted information. *See id.* §§ 552.007, .302, .352.

§ 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received comments from B&W explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude B&W 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 city may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest B&W may have in the information. As no exceptions to disclosure have been raised, the city must release the submitted 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,



Cindy Nettles  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CN/gw

Ref: ID# 770280

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

c: Third Party  
(w/o enclosures)