



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 11, 2019

Mr. Dane Bruun  
Counsel for the Port of Corpus Christi Authority  
Welder, Leshin, Lorenz, McNiff, Buchanan & Hawn, L. L. P.  
800 North Shoreline Boulevard, Suite 300 North  
Corpus Christi, Texas 78401

OR2019-18749

Dear Mr. Bruun:

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# 773146.

The Port of Corpus Christi Authority (the "authority"), which you represent, received a request for a specified lease agreement. The authority claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.104 of the Government Code. Additionally, the authority states release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of Lone Star Ports, LLC ("Lone Star"). Accordingly, the authority states, and provides documentation showing, it notified Lone Star 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 considered the exceptions the authority claims and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>We assume the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

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). 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). The authority states it has specific marketplace interests in the information at issue because the authority is competing with other local and governmental competitors for navigation-related business and long-term business growth. In addition, the authority states release of the submitted information would provide competitors information they could utilize to “undercut [the authority’s] rental rates, minimum throughput requirements, and other commercial terms” providing an unfair advantage in attracting new navigation-related business. Further, the authority argues release of the information at issue would give its competitors “specific knowledge of certain material business terms to expect from [the authority], including economic incentives, which knowledge would allow the [competitors] an unfair competitive advantage in assembling their own economic incentive packages.” 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 governmental body 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 831, 839. After review of the information at issue and consideration of the arguments, we find the authority has established the release of the information at issue would give advantage to a competitor or bidder. Thus, we conclude the authority may withhold the submitted information under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup>

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.

---

<sup>2</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

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 "Lecelle Clarke". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name being more prominent.

Lecelle Clarke  
Attorney  
Open Records Division

LC/jxd

Ref: ID# 773146

c: Requestor

Third Party